
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2023

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/22/3292735

207 Wimbledon Park Road, London SW18 5RH

- 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 Araf Sheikh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/4521, dated 30 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is retention of a roof extension on the rear roof slope and extension over the two-storey back addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposal contains wording that is not a description of development. The proposal should therefore be revised to 'roof extension on the rear roof slope and extension over the two-storey back addition'.
3. At the time of my site visit I observed that there was a part completed roof extension in place at the property. However, the extension that was in place did appear to differ from both the as built and proposed plans and elevations that are before me.
4. In particular, the plans appear to show the parapet wall at the end of the rear roof extension at a level height with the neighbouring dwelling, 207 Wimbledon Park Road (No.207). However, I observed on site that that is not the case with the part completed extension where the parapet wall sits noticeably above that height.
5. Given this, and on the basis that the proposal appears to be based around retaining and completing what has already been constructed, my consideration has been informed by work that has been done to date.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 205 Wimbledon Park Road (No.205) with regard to any overbearing effect and outlook with regard to the rear part of the roof extension.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. Whilst I accept that there may have been some intention to link in with the materials and appearance of the rear extension at No. 207, the rear wall on the roof extension has been built up in a brick type that has a completely different colour and therefore appearance to that within the rear outrigger of the host dwelling at first floor level.
8. This affords the extension a floating appearance which leaves it visually disassociated with the host building that it sits on top of and should be integrating with. The ungainly and jarring appearance of the extension is compounded by the change in brick which is made immediately above the header on the rear window and the poorly joined finish to No.207.
9. Whilst I accept that the rear of the properties on this terrace are varied and do incorporate a wide variety of roof extensions and materials, the extension, for the reasons above detracts significantly from the appearance of the host dwelling. It also therefore causes substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area from where the extension is widely visible to others from nearby gardens by reason of its height.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies DMS 1 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2016) (DMPD) which amongst other things require development of high-quality design which uses appropriate materials.

Living conditions

11. Having considered the available evidence with regard to the neighbouring property and assessed the relationship of the extension to No. 205, there is nothing to persuade me that there would be any significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.205 as a result of the extension with regard to overbearing effect and outlook.
12. The windows on the roof extension of that property would retain their rearward outlook across towards the gardens to the south-east. There would therefore be no conflict with regard to this particular matter with Policy DMS 1 where it requires development does not harm the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties with regard to overbearing and outlook.

Other Matters

13. My attention has been drawn to a lawful development certificate (LDC) (Ref.2019/2677) relating to a rear roof extension. There is clearly a possibility that this could be constructed albeit that the partially completed roof extension relates to the whole roof rather than the rear part detailed under the LDC.
14. However, the drawings show that extension being finished neatly and cleanly in tiles. This would have likely provided such a roof extension with a similar appearance to the cleanly finished and smart extension at No.205. The fallback position would therefore likely be less visually harmful than the scheme before me and I consequently afford this matter limited weight.
15. Whilst a condition is suggested which would require to have the brickwork dyed, there is nothing within the evidence which convinces me that acceptable

results could be achieved via this method. I do not therefore consider that adding such a condition along these lines would remedy the harm that I have identified.

16. I accept that there are a range of roof extensions within the area which it is stated were achieved through permitted development and planning permissions. However, none of the examples drawn to my attention within the evidence or drawn to my attention on the site visit appear to raise the same particular issues that have arisen at this site including those at 173 Wimbledon Park Road and 9 Pirbright Road. I therefore afford these examples limited weight.

Conclusion

17. There is nothing to indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan and I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR