



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/24/3350237

19 Ruvigny Gardens, London SW15 1JR

- 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 Alexandra Goddard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0753.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “loft conversion with amendment to rear roof slope and dormer”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party’s interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Putney Embankment Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of handsome 3-storey terraced houses with the upper floor accommodation largely contained within the roof. It is situated in the Putney Embankment Conservation Area (CA) the special character of which is derived from its unique riverside location, boathouses, former wharf and some of the oldest extant buildings in Putney. Away from the river the CA predominantly comprises handsome late-Victorian and Edwardian mansion blocks and terrace housing.
5. Ruvigny Gardens is a notable example of the latter with its characterful Dutch gables on the south side. The positive contribution the street makes to the character and appearance of the CA is explained in the Putney Embankment Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy which notes that the rear elevations and gardens of the houses on the south side are also visible from the

street, and the open nature of the rear plots, backing onto the smaller rear yards of the shops in Lower Richmond Road is a noticeable and important aspect of the area.

6. The appeal property and its immediate neighbours retain a similar arrangement at upper levels, namely mirrored 2-storey outriggers with shallow pitched roofs and box dormers within the main rear roof slopes. I note that the properties have been altered and extended at ground floor level, and the appeal property benefits from a planning permission¹ for a ground floor wrap-around extension. However, the roof form at the rear gives this end portion of the terrace a high degree of unity which is evident from the rear gardens and from a small section of Ruvigny Gardens. The unified roof form of the appeal property and its neighbours makes a clear and positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
7. Reference has been made to the upper-level rear additions to 15 and 16 Ruvigny Gardens. Rather than being a prevailing characteristic of the terrace these additions are an anomaly in the terrace and do not form the immediate context of the appeal property. The information before me indicates permission for these additions was gained over 10 years' ago prior to the adoption of the current development plan and the publication of the Framework. In my view these additions illustrate the harm that can result from upper-level additions particularly where they extend above eaves level. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits and in the context of current planning policy, I accord limit weight to this matter and the other examples of recent development in the area presented by the appellant.
8. The appeal proposal would comprise the replacement of the main rear roof slope with a mansard, the erection of a mansard addition above the outrigger and the formation of dormer windows in both parts. The upper addition would sit proud of the roof slopes of the houses to either side therefore harming the unity of this part of the terrace. The roof level addition to the outrigger would rise above the adjacent outrigger at the rear of No.20 and create a blank flank elevation that would be highly conspicuous from the street.
9. Individually and in combination the proposed roof additions would, due to their size and elevated siting, result in an overly prominent and incongruous form of development entirely at odds with the appeal property's immediate setting and prevailing roof forms in the terrace. For these reasons the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the terrace and therefore it fails to preserve, and would result in substantial harm to, the character and appearance of the CA. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies LP1 and LP3 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.

Other Matters

10. The officer report before me provides a clear and adequate explanation as to the Council's reasoning behind the refusal of planning permission. I do not therefore

¹ Application ref: 2024-0753

consider that the appellant's ability to put forward a case in support of this appeal has been harmed by "insufficient specificity".

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR