



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2023 by N Manley BA (Hons)

Decision by S Edwards MA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3325090

44 Granville Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 5SQ

- 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 A Salam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2023/0715, dated 22 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Front extension to existing loft level. 2-storey front/side extension. 1st floor extension to rear over current single storey rear extension'.
-

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. In July 2023, the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (WLP) was adopted by the Council. The WLP supersedes the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (adopted March 2016) (DMPD). 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 as part of the appeal process.
4. The Government published on 5 September 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 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.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and

- the living conditions of the occupiers of no 46 Granville Road (no 46) with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

6. No 44 Granville Road (no 44) is an end-of-terrace dwellinghouse located alongside a suburban residential road. The area is predominately characterised by terraced housing set back from a fairly wide tree lined highway. Whilst some of the terraced properties have been extended, they are broadly uniform in design and appearance, thus giving the area a consistent pattern of development. To the east is a more modern four-storey block of residential apartments.
7. The proposal is for the entire dwelling, including the rear extension and dormers, to be widened to encompass the full width of the existing plot and finished in matching or similar materials. At the front a new gable would be erected over the front door. To the rear a second storey would be built away from the shared boundary, covering the full depth of the existing extension and approximately half of its width. The gable end would be facing the garden and the ridge height would be level with the original eaves.
8. The council's concerns relate to the proposed rear extension at first floor level and I shall therefore restrict my further consideration on this aspect of the proposal. The proposed size and scale of this additional extension at first floor level would create a substantial structure in both depth and height. The combined appearance of these elements would result in a built form which would be excessive in terms of scale and massing. Viewed from Granville Road, the extension would appear as an unduly dominant addition in relation to the host dwelling and neighbouring terraced properties. As a whole, the visual effect of the additional second storey to the rear would result in a development which would fail to appear subservient to the original host dwelling.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed rear addition would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies LP1 and LP5 of the WLP, Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted 2016). Amongst other things, these require proposals to follow a design-led approach. They also seek to ensure that development has regard to existing building form and proportions and that rear extensions are subservient to the original host dwelling and not overly dominant.

Living Conditions – outlook and light

10. The adjacent dwelling, no 46, is to the west of the appeal site and is a mid-terrace property with a north facing garden. It has a single floor rear extension and fenestration in the side elevation facing towards the appeal property.
11. The form of the proposal would be similar to that of an outrigger extension. Whilst there may be similar examples of these across London, the height and depth of the proposed development would result in a prominent structure in terms of scale and mass, which would protrude significantly above the boundary shared with this neighbouring property. Although the windows to the side elevation are not the only openings of the extension, the outlook from

these windows would be considerably restricted by the proposed development. Coupled with the proximity to the neighbouring garden, the appeal scheme would appear oppressive and lead to an undue sense of enclosure and would be harmful to the outlook from no 46.

12. I have considered the appellant's argument that the development should be viewed in the context of the nearby four storey residential apartment block. However, the proposed extension would be built considerably closer to this neighbouring property. I find the distance between no 46 and the apartment block does not mitigate the harmful sense of enclosure and overbearing impact which would result from the proposal. Consequently, this would not outweigh the harm caused to the outlook of these neighbouring residents.
13. The appellant provided a Solar Studies report assessing the likelihood of any potential overshadowing onto no 46 because of the proposal. In the absence of any substantive contradictory evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree with the report's findings. Therefore, I am satisfied there would be no significant change to the level of daylight and sunlight the rear garden of no 46 receives and overall, there would be no unacceptable loss of light for the occupiers of this neighbouring property.
14. Although I have found that the extension would not lead to a harmful loss of light for the occupiers of no 46, that is outweighed by the harm which it would cause to the living conditions of these residents, with particular regard to outlook. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policy LP2 of the WLP and the Housing SPD, which notably seek to ensure that development is not visually intrusive, overbearing or create a sense of enclosure.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The development would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation. The proposed extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, but also to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. There are no material considerations, which indicate that the appeal should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. On that basis, the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR