



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3330482

66 Battersea Bridge Rd, London SW11 3AG

- 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 J Taylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2022/4615, dated 11 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "First and second floor extension to rear of property along with roof dormer".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the erection of a first and second floor extension. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the installation of a roof dormer at 66 Battersea Bridge Rd, London SW11 3AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/4615, dated 11 November 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: PL-501, PL-502, PL-504, PL505, PL-506 in so far as they relate to the works approved.
 - 3) No development shall take place until details of the dormer including detailed drawings and samples of materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. The Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (LP) was adopted in July 2023, shortly 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 The now superseded policies referred to in the decision notice no longer require consideration.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 locally listed host building and whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Westbridge Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a dwelling that occupies the first and second floors of part of a handsome 3-storey terrace. There is a shop on the ground floor that extends to the rear boundary of the site above which a roof terrace has been formed to provide outdoor amenity space for the dwelling.
5. The terrace is locally listed and comprises 6 early Victorian properties with paired slate-clad hipped roofs, regularly spaced windows and generally high-quality shopfronts. At the rear the properties predominately retain their original form at upper levels. The group make a clear positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Westbridge Road Conservation Area (CA), a matter to which I attach significant weight.
6. The proposal would primarily comprise the erection of a part single and part 2-storey addition above the roof terrace to create additional residential accommodation at first and second floor levels. The main double-storey element would have a flat roof just below eaves level and the rear wall of the addition would line through with the single-storey first floor addition to the rear of the next-door property.
7. I note that the rear addition would not be visible from Battersea Bridge Road and the area to the rear of the appeal site is of limited heritage value. However, the rear addition would occupy almost the entirety of the rear elevation of the appeal property, would be a storey higher than the neighbouring addition and increase the footprint of the dwelling by more than 50%. In the context of a terrace of high-quality properties where second floor additions are absent and full-width first floor additions are few, the proposed double-storey extension would be an overly dominant and incongruous addition.
8. I therefore conclude that, due to its siting and size, the predominately 2-storey rear extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the locally listed host building and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The harm to this heritage asset would be substantial.
9. For the reasons outlined above the proposed rear extension fails to accord with LP Policies LP1 and LP3, which seek to ensure that developments provide a high-quality design that contributes positively to local character and preserves the significance, appearance and character of heritage assets. There is also conflict with LP Policy LP5 which seeks rear extensions that are subservient to host buildings and not overly dominant.
10. The proposal also includes the installation of a small dormer within the rear roof slope. Whilst I note that there is an absence of dormers on the terrace, dormers are a characteristic of the wider area and the proposed dormer would be compatible with the scale of the appeal property and its appearance can be controlled by a planning condition requiring the submission and approval of materials and design details.

11. For these reasons I am satisfied that this aspect of the proposal would preserve the appearance of the CA, would not have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the locally listed host building and accords with the aforementioned policies. The dormer is physically and functionally severable from the rear extension and therefore a split decision can be made allowing this element of the proposal.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, and for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed, in so far as the drawings relate to the approved dormer.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal shall fail in respect of the rear extension and succeed in respect of the installation of a dormer on the rear roof slope.

S Poole

INSPECTOR