



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3324145

134 Clapham Common West Side, London SW4 9BD

- 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 Matthew Cox against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2023/1230, dated 29 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as the erection of a dormer roof extension with a rooflight to the rear closet wing roof slope of existing end-of-terrace property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (LP) was adopted in July 2023, after the determination of the planning application. The now superseded policies referred to in the decision notice no longer require consideration. The new LP policies are referred to in the reason for refusal and therefore the appellant was able to take them into account when the appeal was lodged.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Clapham Common Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey Edwardian end-of-terrace house with a pitched roof, 2-storey outrigger to the rear and a large dormer in the rear roof slope. It occupies a corner site and as a consequence the outrigger and rear roof slope are highly conspicuous in views looking along Alfriston Road, the street running parallel to the site's side boundary.
5. The property is situated within the Clapham Common Conservation Area (CA). This comprises the western part of the Common and the buildings facing it, which include a mix of grand houses, semi-detached houses, blocks of flats and terraced housing. The terraced housing on Clapham Common West Side forms

a handsome backdrop to the Common and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.

6. The appeal proposal would comprise the erection of a roof extension above the rear outrigger to create a narrow dressing area/store. This addition would have a flat roof, abut the existing rear dormer and occupy about half of the roof. The use of slate cladding would, to a small degree, limit the impact of the addition. However, this would not disguise the proposal's box-like form which, due to its prominent siting, would result in an incongruous and alien addition to the appeal property, the neighbouring street scene and the CA.
7. The appellant has highlighted the high number of rear roof extensions in Alfriston Road. There is no evidence before me that these additions have been granted planning permission in recent years and in some cases planning permission may not have been required. Notwithstanding this, unlike the appeal proposal, these rear additions are not apparent from the public realm and fall outside the CA. I also note the character and scale of nearby corner properties and the fact some of these properties have been extended in the past. None of the developments referred to are directly comparable to the appeal proposal and as each planning application must be considered on its individual merits I attribute limited weight to these matters.
8. Due to its siting, size and appearance I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal would simply provide extra space within a private residence there would be no substantive public benefits.
9. For the reasons outlined above the proposal fails to accord with LP Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5, which seek to ensure that developments provide a high-quality design that contributes positively to local character, and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which requires development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, to conserve their significance. There is also conflict with the aims of Clapham Common Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy (2007) and the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016).

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR