
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3360542

The Coach House, 1 Winfrith Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 3BE

- 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 Blair Hawthorne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/3869.
 - The development proposed is described as “creation of a second storey to provide better quality of living space, with materials to match the existing and internal alterations. Window on first floor to be widened”,
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The appellants have expressed concerns over the Council’s assessment of the height of the proposal. I am satisfied that, based on the evidence provided, the Council have adequately assessed the appeal scheme on the amended plans.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area and b) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to Numbers 246 and 248 Earlsfield Road (No 246 & No 248).

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is a good quality surviving example of a detached former Coach House which is individual in its siting, design and sits modestly within its plot. It is in amongst larger scale and more modern architecture. It has retained its period features such as the stone header piece, the parapet wall and its traditional diminutive scale. Its uniqueness and originality contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Whilst the appeal scheme would replicate the aforementioned characterful features, the substantially increased height would unacceptably erode the traditional qualities

of the building's scale. The additional height of the ridge and eaves in terms of the wider street scene and the surrounding dwellings would not be harmful, however, it would detract from the modest originality of the building. This would result in an unbalanced and unnaturally narrow building which would also appear out of proportion with the small plot.

7. Other examples of roof extensions have been referred to within the surrounding context, however limited information has been given on them and the prevailing policies and considerations at the time they were carried out. Moreover, they are not directly comparable to this scheme considering their rearward projection, varying building type and more importantly the special qualities of the building subject of this appeal. My findings do not therefore change.
8. With this and the above in mind, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would lead to conflict with Policies LP1, LP2 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (WLP) 2023, the London Plan 2021 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) 2024 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Living Conditions

9. Nos 246 & 248 occupy one mass of built form to the side of the appeal site at approximately 3 stories. They have windows and outside spaces facing the appeal building. The appeal proposal would not bring the footprint closer to them nor increase the land take and therefore the separation distance between the buildings would remain the same. As a result, and even with the increase in height, due to the existing siting and the track path of the sun, I am not convinced that there would be an unacceptable reduction in the light experienced within the building as a whole by occupiers and it would not result in unacceptable harm to the light afforded to the property or the garden spaces.
10. As above, and due to the modest increase in height and existing siting of the building, the effects on outlook would be limited. Additionally, the proposal would only affect a limited number of windows to the property which already face to the original building at relatively close quarters. The increase would not be substantially different from their viewpoint. The proposed side elevation would retain the relatively blank façade; however, it would not be materially different to the current situation. Whilst there is no denying that the occupiers would be able to see the additional storey, the quality and standard of outlook would remain. Moreover, the rear gardens and surrounding spaces, small though they are, serving the property would remain unincumbered and retain an otherwise open aspect.
11. This element of the proposal would therefore not harmfully affect the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 246 or 248. Resultantly, and in regard to this main issue, there would be compliance with Policies LP1, LP2 and LP5 of the WLP 2023, the London Plan 2021 and the Framework 2024 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the living conditions of occupiers of properties are protected.

Other Matter

12. Support of the proposals does not absolve me from making an assessment of the appeal scheme against the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, specifically in regard to the first main issue. I have found in the appellant's favour on the second, but this would be a lack of harm and thus neutral in any balance. I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate from the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR