



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/23/3331594

31B Harbut Road, Wandsworth, London, SW11 2RA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Page against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2023/1929.
 - The development proposed is erection of a dormer roof extension for the upper flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a dormer roof extension for the upper flat at 31B Harbut Road, Wandsworth, London SW11 2RA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/1929, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1.) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 2.) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: 03 Rev A, 04 Rev A, 05, 06, 07 Rev A, 09, 0011.
 - 3.) All external materials used in the construction of the development hereby approved shall match the type, texture, tone, colour, size and profile of those used on the existing building and shall be retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 19 December 2023, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been significantly amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property relates to the top floor unit of a 2-storey mid terrace building situated within a street scene of similar properties. The appeal property and the other dwellings within the terrace include 2 storey rear additions with pitched roofs. The rear elevation of the appeal property is not

visible from the wider street scene. The proposal relates to extensions to the rear roof and the roof above the 2-storey rear addition. The proposal would extend across much of the width and depth of the rear addition.

5. The Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) provides guidance on extensions over rear additions, stating that “to avoid harming your neighbour’s amenities it may be that you will not be allowed to extend over the full length of the back addition. In these cases it will be necessary to restrict the length of the extension to the area closest to the main house to leave up to 50% of the original back addition unaltered.” Based on the above wording, it appears that the SPD allows for extensions larger than 50% of the size of the original rear addition where the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties would not be harmed.
6. There is no suggestion that the additional bulk would be more intrusive or over-bearing on neighbouring properties or that it would result in a loss of light to the windows at No 33 given the separation between the proposed extension and the site boundary. Consequently, it would not appear to be necessary to limit the size of the extension to the rear addition to 50% of its original size.
7. The existing chimney stacks would be retained and the extension would be in keeping with the materials of the host building. The extension would be set down from the parapet wall and set in from the sides of the rear addition and thus would not appear unduly bulky or have the appearance of a ‘top heavy’ extension. Moreover, no part of the rear roof extension would be visible from the street scene. Thus, the development would not appear visually obtrusive or incongruous. Whilst the roof extension would not achieve the 70 degree slope recommended for the face of such developments in the SPD, it would respect the scale, form and hierarchy of the rear addition and I am satisfied that the lack of a 70 degree slope would not be unacceptably harmful in this context.
8. Drawing on the above, I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore find no conflict with Policies LP1, LP2 or LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (2023) which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development relates positively to the local character and that roof alterations are sympathetic to the style of the building. I also find no conflict with the SPD for the reasons set out above.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, on which the appellant has had the opportunity to comment. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard 3 year time limit condition for implementation. In addition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans in the interest of certainty. In the interest of the character and appearance of the appeal property, a condition is necessary to control the external materials of the development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

N Robinson INSPECTOR