



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3334772**

**44 Pentlow Street, Putney, London SW15 1LX**

- 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 Ayan Sengupta against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref 2023/2569, dated 7 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 September May 2023.
  - The development proposed is for alterations including erection of roof extension to main rear roof slope with French doors and safety railing and two rooflights to the front roof slope.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for alterations including erection of roof extension to main rear roof slope with French doors and safety railing and two rooflights to the front roof slope at 44 Pentlow Street, Putney, London SW15 1LX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/2746, dated 19 July 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions: -
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: PP-06; PP-07; PP-08; PP-09, PP-10 and PP-11.

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposal and omits the cross-references to a previous application which was included on the application form.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. No. 44 is a mid-terrace property that is part of a small group of properties in a cul de sac off Pentlow Street built circa 1990s. The property has been designed to reflect the traditional form of the nearby terraced properties and has a two-storey projection to the rear. Whilst none of the other properties within the cul de sac has altered the roof form, dormer windows and terraces, including over the rear projection, are a notable feature of the wider area.
5. The proposed dormer window would cover a large proportion of the main roof slope, but in line with the guidance in the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) it is designed to be set down from the ridge line and inset from the sides. The reference to a 70-degree pitch in the SPD relates to mansard roof additions to mid-terraced houses with traditional exposed party walls, which is not the arrangement here.
6. The rear of the property is visible from the surrounding roads and the adjacent park which has a footpath running parallel to the rear of the property. Other than from directly behind, the rear projections to the appeal property and that of the adjacent neighbour (No.46) would in part screen the dormer and views would be filtered by the trees. Moreover, other properties backing onto the park exhibit box-style dormer windows, and whilst there is uniformity to the properties within the cul de sac, any distinguishment between these and the more prevalent older properties is not overly discernible in general views from the rear.
7. I appreciate that permitted development rights have been removed from the appeal property. Whilst this allows for any potential development to be assessed, it is not a mechanism to directly protect the existing building and preclude all alterations. In my view there is nothing particularly special or unusual with the roof line, the dormer reflects the Council's design guidance, and, specifically in the context of the surrounding area, I do not find that the addition would be incongruous or out of keeping.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would integrate with the prevailing character of the area and accordingly would accord with Policies LP1, LP2, and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) and the Housing SPD which require development to be of high-quality design, sympathetic to the host property and in keeping with the character of the locality.

### **Conditions and Conclusion**

9. In line with the statutory requirements, and for certainty conditions, are imposed to ensure that the scheme is carried out in accordance with the appropriate timescale and the submitted plans. It is also necessary in the interests of the appearance of the property for the materials to match.
10. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR