



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/24/3351627

1 Ravenstone Street, Wandsworth, London SW12 9ST

- 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 Owyn Tong Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application reference is 2024/2145.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension to main rear roof with rooflights to the front roof, partial roof extension over back addition and concealed roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. On 12 December 2024, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework 2024) was published with an amendment issued on 7 February 2025. The Framework 2024, as amended, does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Background and main issue

3. The Council has recently granted planning permission for a roof level extension at the appeal property with windows to the rear and side, and roof lights at the front. The proposed development is the same as the approved scheme apart from the addition of a roof terrace enclosed by an opaque glazed screen. As the approved scheme could come forward in any event, it is a realistic fall back against which the proposed development should be assessed.
4. The main issue is, therefore, the effect of the proposed roof terrace on the living conditions of the residential occupiers of 8 Station Parade with particular regard to outlook, sense of enclosure and potential noise and general disturbance.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is the first floor flat within a 2-storey end terrace building that addresses Ravenstone Street within an area that is mixed in character. Just beyond a narrow alleyway alongside No 1 are the 2 and 3-storey projections at the back of a terrace, called Station Parade, that faces Balham High Road. The main parties note that the new roof terrace would be about 2-metres away from the second-floor rear windows of 8 Station Parade. Given this modest separation distance, it is the residential occupiers of No 8 that are most likely to be affected by the appeal scheme.

6. Two second floor rear windows of No 8 would almost directly face the proposed roof terrace. These windows appear to serve a lounge, which is a habitable room within which people can be expected to spend a reasonable amount of time. In views from these windows, the opaque glass panels of the new screen would give it a lightweight appearance compared to that of a solid wall or roof slope. The proposed screen would also be lower than the top of the mansard roof extension, which also forms part of the appeal scheme.
7. However, the proposal would still introduce a significant new feature and views towards it from the upper rear windows of No 8 would be at close range. To my mind, the proximity of the proposed screen alongside the sidewall of the new mansard would have an over dominant impact on outlook. Due to its height and position, the new screen, when seen together with the proposed mansard roof, would also unduly heighten a sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No 8. Its harmful impact would not be mitigated by the presence of other upper side windows that also serve the lounge of No 8.
8. As the new roof terrace would introduce an area of outdoor amenity space, it would allow a small number of people to gather or sit outside and so could it give rise to an increase in noise and general disturbance. The new addition would be small, and the level of associated activity would not necessarily be any greater than that generated by the reasonable use of outdoor amenity space at ground level or from roof terraces of other properties. The noise from traffic using the busy Balham High Road is also likely to be evident, as was the case at the site visit. Noise could also emanate from rooms within the approved roof extension if the windows were left open, as the appellant suggests. Even so, activities on the new roof terrace such as people talking loudly or music playing would take place immediately beyond the second-floor rear windows of No 8 and the proposal would be an additional source of disturbance to others.
9. There are several roof terraces at the back of properties in the local area including those to which the appellant has referred and provided some photographs. I am not aware of the detailed circumstances that led to these existing roof terraces and so I am unable to gauge the extent to which they are directly comparable with those of the proposal. In any event, each proposal should be assessed on its own merits. Having done so, it is the uneasy relationship between the new roof terrace and the second-floor rear windows of No 8 that is objectionable in this instance.
10. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the residential occupiers of No 8. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy LP2 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 and the Supplementary Planning Document, *Housing*, insofar as they aim to safeguard residential amenity. It would also be at odds with the Framework 2024, which states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for all users.
11. Overall, I find that the proposed development conflicts with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework 2024, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR