
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/22/3311300

113 Selkirk Road, London SW17 0EW

- 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 & Ms Phillips & Clarke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application ref. 2022/2796, dated 29 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a hip to gable side roof extension, with a mansard roof extension to the main rear roof and the erection of an extension above part of the two storey back addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable side roof extension, with a mansard roof extension to the main rear roof and the erection of an extension above part of the two storey back addition at 113 Selkirk Road, London SW17 0EW in accordance with the terms of the application ref 022/2796, dated 29 June 2022, subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, ST_MAY_113 SEL_001, ST_MAY_113 SEL_002 Rev B

3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing dwelling..

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council refers to policies of the Wandsworth Publication Version Local Plan. This is currently at the examination stage and has not yet been adopted by the Council as part of its development plan. Accordingly, I can only give such policies limited weight in the decision-making process.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring houses having regard to outlook, overbearing impact and light.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-terrace, two-storey house with a small front garden on Selkirk Road, near the junction with Khama Road. The surrounding neighbourhood comprises high-density residential properties with on-street parking.
5. I observed at my site visit that the rear windows and patios of the single dwelling at 22 Khama Road and the two flats at 115 Selkirk Road (the adjacent properties) are already enclosed and dominated by the substantial two-storey side walls of the appeal property and its outrigger. I note from the plans that the overall mass and height of the proposed alterations to the main house and the addition over the outrigger would broadly reflect the scale and design of other similar extensions in the vicinity, and that two of the first floor windows to 115 Selkirk Road are small and serve a bathroom and toilet, which are not deemed to be habitable rooms.
6. The hip-to-gable element would be set against the backdrop of the existing appeal dwelling and would not protrude beyond its existing front or rear elevations. Although the mansard roof and addition over the outrigger would project outwards and upwards, within the context of the scale of the existing built form, and its proximity to the adjacent properties, the impact of the alterations would be relatively limited. To my mind, any changes in the outlook from the openings at both ground and first floor level of the adjacent properties would be minor. Views in other directions, for example towards Graveney Road towards the southeast, would be maintained and unimpeded.
7. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not have an unduly oppressive or intrusive effect on living conditions. Even when viewed through the ground floor openings, the proposal is unlikely to result in a sense of confinement or enclosure sufficient to cause adverse harm above and beyond the current situation. In a high-density area such as this, it would clearly not be unusual to be able to see the built form of other dwellings from living rooms or bedrooms. Taken in the round, whilst I acknowledge that there is some effect, I consider that any overbearing impact is not so harmful as to warrant dismissal of the appeal.
8. The existing built arrangement between the appeal dwelling and the adjacent properties already causes a loss of light in the morning to their rear windows and patios. The appellants concede that there would be some additional loss of light due to the scheme. However, as the day progresses the path of the sun will naturally pass the built limits of the extended appeal dwelling, and light in the afternoon reaching the adjacent properties would not be unduly affected. With this in mind, I am of the view that the appeal scheme will result in no adverse loss of daylight or sunlight above and over that which is presently experienced. In this context I find that the development would not be so unneighbourly as to warrant a refusal of planning permission on this ground.
9. I consider that the proposal would not result in material harm to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring houses having regard to outlook, overbearing impact and light. It would accord with policy DMS1 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (March 2016) and the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (November 2016) which seek to ensure that development does not harm the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those on the existing dwelling would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

11. Based on the foregoing and all other matters put forward, the appeal succeeds.

C Hall

INSPECTOR