



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3327862
58 Massingberd Way, London SW17 6AD

- 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 Ms Lisa Gatherar against the decision of Wandsworth Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/2077, dated 30 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dormer extension to main rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has been largely completed; this does not alter the way I consider the merits of the proposal. Amended plans were submitted during the course of the planning application's consideration by the Council. These show two rear facing windows, in line with those on the levels below, rather than a single larger one which is presently in situ. I shall determine the scheme on the basis of the dual window proposal and thus the text below will generally be in the future tense.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a three-storey, terraced house built as part of a wider redevelopment the late 1990s. The house is constructed in brick with a tiled, pitched roof; there are front and rear gardens. The rear garden and terraced run are largely mirrored behind by a terrace behind and rear enclosure is completed by blocks of flats. The locality is now of established residential character with uniformity on parts of the estate and complementary variety evident elsewhere, and along with garden areas and interestingly laid out streets, this all comes together to create an area of pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above; a flat roofed vertical faced structure and dimensions are noted as approximately 2.5m high, 4.4m wide and 4m deep.
 5. The box-like structure would excessively remove the great majority of the pitched roof form and display little or no subtlety of design. With this form and scale, it would unduly dominate the host property. It would look extremely
-

alien in a row of otherwise unaltered roof forms and surrounds where original pitched roofs of a generally uniform nature predominate and establish a local distinctiveness and visual harmony. The disruption of the roof line would unfortunately be palpable. The proposal would be jarring on the eye, appear awkward and incongruous on the host property, and would diminish the character and visual qualities of this locality.

6. Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (July 2023) (LP) are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, these policies seek high quality design, with suitable scale and appearance. These development plan policies also make it clear that extensions should generally be proportionate and subordinate to a host property, safeguard uniformity where appropriate, and respect immediate and wider context and local character. In all the circumstances I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to LP Policies LP1 and LP5.

Other matters

7. I understand the wish to increase floorspace in the property and I can see that thought has been given to external materials. I note the fact that the Council did not raise residential amenity issues. As mentioned above I am considering the dual window scheme and whilst that would introduce a degree of vertical symmetry it certainly would not make the scheme aesthetically acceptable in my opinion.
8. I sympathise that expense has been incurred through the Appellant not realising that planning permission was required. However, I would have not allowed an appeal for this scheme if it had not been in situ and I have to be even-handed. It is not my role to enter into a debate over whether this would 'normally' be 'permitted development' nor, as the Appellant fairly notes, would I be allowed (or wish to) revisit the original planning condition which placed restrictions on the host property and its neighbours.
9. I have reviewed other examples of dormers which were drawn to my attention. However, there seems little of direct comparison due to siting, form, or location, and in any event, I must assess the present case on its own merits. I have carefully considered all points raised by the Appellant and I conclude that the matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies above mirror its relevant objectives.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR