
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024

by **F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/24/3349481

67B Bolingbroke Grove, Wandsworth, London SW11 6HE

- 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 Ms Kerrigan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0828.
 - The development proposed is new additional floor and mansard roof with new dormer & new ground floor doors within rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. I have considered the changes and as they are not material to the proposal, further comments were not sought by the parties. I have, however, determined the appeal having regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area (Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated in the Conservation Area that comprises of a historic grid street pattern with notable areas of open space. The buildings are generally set a short distance back behind front garden areas and contain a rich level of architectural detailing and make use of a generally consistent palette of materials. These features combine to contribute positively to the traditional character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
5. The proposed mansard extension on the main rear roof would feature a gentle 70-degree roof slope and make use of matching materials. It would however also result in the building up of the gable wall to Bramfield Road in a prominent corner location. This would not add visual interest but would rather alter the roof profile in a way that would detract from the traditional roof form of properties in the Conservation Area.
6. The proposal also consists of an addition over the full depth of the rear outrigger. This element of the proposal would use high quality materials and, in this regard,

would integrate with the mansard proposal on the main roof. The windows and other detailing would reflect those on the existing building, but this element of the proposal over the entire rear outrigger would add significant bulk to the appeal property, and result in an unbalanced appearance with the adjoining outrigger at No. 66. The raising of the party wall would also result in an awkward relationship with this neighbouring property.

7. Whilst the development would sit below the main roof line, the large amount of built form, particularly above the rear outrigger would result in the proposal failing to be subservient to the existing building. The limited areas of glazing, particularly on the side elevation to Bramfield Road would do little to break up the significant mass of the proposal.
8. Bramfield Road is mostly outside the Conservation Area, however, more immediately, and contrary to the appellant's view, the proposed development would be seen from this road to the side of appeal site from within the Conservation Area. The proposed development would also be visible from parts of Bolingbroke Grove, albeit such views would be along only a short section of this road. As such, and notwithstanding the more limited visibility of the proposed development from Wandsworth Common itself, the proposal would be harmful to the traditional character of the Conservation Area for the reasons set out.
9. I was able to see that there is some variation at roof level nearby owing to different extensions and alterations on properties and note reference to the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (November 2016) (SPD), which sets out the importance of maintaining variety between buildings where this is a distinctive feature of the street. Despite the presence of some variation, the appeal property and the terrace that it forms part of do not have any additions on the rear outriggers and nor does No. 68, the other corner property on to Bramfield Road. The SPD, at paragraph 4.156, also sets out the need to avoid bulky extensions in very prominent locations, and more specifically, for mansard style extensions to not be applied in a corner location where it is clearly visible from the street.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal building and it would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In terms of the Framework, I assess the harm to be less than substantial. Even so, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. The appellant has set out that the proposal would result in the repair of a building in a poor condition. The appeal property currently comprises of a three-bedroom residential unit with a Lounge and Kitchen/Dining area over a number of floors. The quality of the accommodation, including the thermal performance of the building could be improved without the increase in floorspace proposed. As such, this amounts to a public benefit of limited weight.
12. Consequently, the public benefits that would arise from the proposal do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the heritage asset, to which the Framework states great weight should be afforded. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the Framework in terms of its aims to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets.

13. As such, the appeal development would conflict with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (Local Plan), which seek, amongst other matters, for development proposals to sustain, preserve and wherever possible, enhance the significance of any heritage asset. It would also be contrary to the SPD and the Framework, which seek the highest standards of design for development and to protect or enhance heritage assets, in addition to being contrary to the aims of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area Appraisal, which seeks to safeguard the special interest of the Conservation Area.

Other Matters

14. Reference has been made to a number of developments in the area, including a mansard roof extension at No. 76. There is however no planning history for this development. Although it does form part of the context near the appeal site, the majority of properties in the vicinity of the site along Bolingbroke Grove do not have such full-length extensions above the rear outriggers. In any event, this referenced development does little to support the proposal and serves to demonstrate the harm that would be caused by a large extension above the rear outrigger such as that proposed on this appeal.
15. The circumstances of other mansard extensions in the area, such as those on No's 31-35 Bolingbroke Grove are different to the case before me as they only marginally increased the height of the rear outriggers and are on properties of a different style to that of the appeal property.
16. No. 70 has an extension over the rear outrigger, but this predates the SPD and is on a mid-terrace property. Reference has also been made to No. 68, but the development on this property is confined to the main roof and not the rear outrigger and nor has this referenced development seen alterations to the gable, like the appeal proposal. I can confirm that I have dealt with this appeal on its own merits based on the evidence before me.
17. The appeal building is not listed but this is a neutral matter and not one which weighs in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion

18. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR