



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2022 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/22/3296051

43 Headington Road, London SW18 3PR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jamie Wood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/2687, dated 18 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2021.
 - The development is a proposed two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Magdalen Park Conservation Area (MPCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. I have had regard to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which places a duty upon the decision-maker, in the exercise of planning functions, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) further advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located on a corner plot on Headington Road close to the junction with Leckford Road. The dwelling is located within the Openview Estate which forms part of the MPCA. The significance of this part of the MPCA is largely derived from the harmonious appearance that comes from the use of similar architectural features and materials, it has a spacious feel, with wide streets and dwellings set back from corners. Generally, the short terraces and semi-detached dwellings on the estate have a consistent and symmetrical appearance.

6. Given the appeal property's corner plot, the proposal, in particular the first floor additions would be highly visible from Headington Road and when looking south from the junction with Leckford Road. The extension would substantially change the appearance of the appeal property, not only would it appear significantly wider, the addition of a terrace and metal railings at first floor level and the use of a flat-topped roof would appear incongruous and fail to relate well to the original design of the host dwelling.
7. Whilst I note that the appellant states that the proposal would not extend beyond the current building line of the properties along Headington Road, the application drawings show that part of the proposed extension, including the balcony would protrude slightly forward of the main front elevation of No 41, which is itself positioned forward of the main building line of the terrace. Furthermore, the appeal property is on a corner plot, with the frontage orientated towards the junction of Headington and Leckford Roads, it therefore differs from the terrace layout of the properties fronting Headington Road.
8. The scale, massing, design and position of the proposed two storey extension would detract from the feeling of spaciousness caused by the tapering of built development and the set-back position of the appeal dwelling at the junction of Headington and Leckford Roads.
9. With regard to the symmetry with the adjoining property, mature landscaping features in the garden of No. 18 Leckford Road currently obscure views from the front so that the visual symmetry is not immediately apparent. However, other than some minor details, including the colour of the window frames, the properties have been built as a symmetrical pair typical of the style found in the MPCA. Given the prominent corner location of the properties this can still be appreciated in views from Headington and Leckford Roads. The scale, massing, design and position of the proposal, would upset the balance of the properties and the change in symmetry would be unacceptably harmful including in views from Headington Road.
10. The harm that the proposed development would cause to the significance of the MPCA would be less than substantial. While I acknowledge the private benefits of extending the appeal dwelling for the appellant, this does not amount to public benefits which paragraph 202 of the Framework advises must be weighed against the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. There are not any identified public benefits which would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the MPCA in the evidence before me.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the MPCA. It would be contrary to Policies PL 1 and IS 3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted March 2016) which seek, amongst other things to protect local distinctiveness and character and conserve and enhance heritage assets. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (Adopted March 2016) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure development is of a high quality design, is an appropriate scale and appearance, and protects the character and appearance of heritage assets.
12. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (adopted March 2021) and to the Framework which require proposals to be of

the highest quality of design and to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

Other Matters

13. I note that the appellant has discussed the proposal with his immediate neighbours, and it has been expressed that a side extension at the appeal property would be preferable to a front or rear extension, taking into account that No.16 Leckford Road features an extension that borders the appeal property at the rear. I also recognise that the appellant is unhappy with the current layout and design of the property, including the garden configuration and feels a side extension is the only option to meet his spatial requirements. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm which I have identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A Parkin

INSPECTOR