



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/24/3346763
105 Deodar Road, London SW15 2NU

- 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 Peter Durber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2023/4670.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extension to form an additional floor of accommodation, including French doors and safety railings to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the setting of the neighbouring locally listed building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Deodar Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 3-storey house with an integral garage. It is situated in the Deodar Road Conservation Area (CA) which is a predominately residential area. The heritage significance of the CA is largely derived from the handsome late-Victorian/Edwardian houses to the west of the appeal site, which have long back gardens that slope down towards the River Thames to the rear.
4. The appeal property is set apart from these houses and occupies a relatively exposed site. There are long views towards the front of the house from Deodar Road, its flank elevation is visible from the Wandsworth Park, and its rear can be viewed from the River Thames and the nearby footbridge over the river. The property is situated next to, and therefore forms part of the setting of, 109-115 Deodar Road, an elegant late 1850s locally listed building which is described as "the undoubted shining star in the conservation area" in the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011).
5. The information before me indicates that the appeal property was built in the late 1980s. In the context of the earlier and more traditional houses in the street its vaguely neo-classical design makes it somewhat of an anomaly in the street scene. It does however mirror the height of neighbouring buildings.

6. The proposal would comprise the erection of a mansard roof extension to enable the formation of an additional floor of living accommodation. This would include a pair of narrow dormer windows at the front and glazed doors to the rear leading to a terrace overlooking the Thames.
7. The roof addition would be symmetrically arranged and compatible with the style of the appeal property. As such it would not result in unacceptable harm in this respect. However, the addition would make the appeal property markedly taller than its neighbours and increase its prominence in views from the street, park and river. The already anomalous and incongruous nature of the appeal property would be accentuated resulting in harm to the setting of the neighbouring locally listed building and the appearance of the CA.
8. I conclude therefore that due to its siting, elevated position and bulk the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street scene and therefore fails to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. For the same reason it would also have an unacceptable effect on the setting of 109-115 Deodar Road. As such the proposal fails to accord with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2022) which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that developments provide a high-quality design that contributes positively to local character.
9. Whilst the proposal would result in harm to heritage assets, this harm would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides extra private space for the occupiers of the appeal property there would be no public benefits arising from it.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR