



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2023 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA

Decision by S Edwards MA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3326158

60 Lyford Road, London SW18 3JJ

- 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. Bella Marcelin-Rice against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2022/4922, dated 30 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as: "Alterations including erection of part single, part two-storey side/rear extension; removal of garage doors and installation of replacement windows in connection with use of garage as additional habitable accommodation; erection of dormers to main side and rear roof slopes; installation of window to first floor side elevation."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published on 5 September 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.
4. In July 2023, the Council adopted the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (LP). The LP notably replaces the policies contained within the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (Adopted March 2016), which was cited in the Council's Reason for Refusal. Accordingly, I shall consider the appeal in accordance with the most up-to-date policies, on which the parties have had the opportunity to comment during the course of the appeal.

5. The description of the proposal includes elements which have previously been granted planning permission¹ by the Council. The main difference between the approved scheme and the appeal proposal relates to the proposed roof alterations. My findings focus on the effect of the proposed roof extension, which constitutes the main area of dispute between the appellant and the Council.
6. The description of development provided in the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description of development provided in the appellant's appeal form as it accurately reflects the proposal before me.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the appearance of the appeal property.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. The appeal property comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, with additional residential accommodation within the roof space. The appeal site is in a residential area and overlooks Wandsworth Common to the front. Other properties on Lyford Road near to the appeal site are predominantly detached or semi-detached dwellings of similar design.
9. The proposed roof extension would be significantly wider than the existing and the previously approved dormers. By reason of its excessive size and scale, the proposed dormer would dominate the roof space and thus appear as a visually intrusive addition, which would not be subservient to the host building, particularly as it would wrap around two different roof slopes. This would result in a form of development which would not complement the appeal property. The incongruous nature of the proposed roof extension would be evident from Lyford Road and would also likely be visible from Herondale Avenue, during the autumn and winter months, when trees are not in leaf.
10. The appellant has cited similar works approved for neighbouring buildings, but there is not sufficient evidence to support this claim. Furthermore, I have not seen in the area other examples of dormer windows of a comparable scale and design to the proposal. Although the proposed dormer is an amendment to the previously approved (2021/4813) dormers, compared to the existing dormer it would be a considerable size addition and therefore harmfully detract from the appearance of the appeal property. Taking all of this into consideration, I give significant weight to the harm which the proposed dormer would cause to the appearance of the appeal property.
11. For these reasons, the proposed roof extension would cause significant harm to the appearance of the appeal property. Consequently, it would be contrary to LP Policies LP1 and LP5. These policies require a design-led approach which ensures the proposal has a high level of physical integration with their surroundings, that residential extensions and alterations respect and/or complement the form of the host property and would be visually subservient to it, as well as rear extensions not being overly dominant.

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference 2021/4813.

Other Matters

12. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the effect of the proposal on the significance of Wandsworth Conservation Area, and there are no reasons for me to reach an alternative view. Having regard to the position of the proposed development, I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole, and thus its significance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Although the proposal would provide additional residential accommodation, this would be outweighed by the harm which the dormer would cause to the host property. There are no material considerations, which indicate that the appeal should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the recommendation. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed roof extension would harm the appearance of the host property. On that basis, the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR