
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3359389

234 Flat B Battersea Bridge Road, Wandsworth, London SW11 3AA

- 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 Sidi Shatku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1085.
 - The proposed development is described as 'Removal of main roof: erection of roof extension, with raised party walls, to provide an additional floor of accommodation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has suggested that an alternative scheme of the yellow / brown London stock brickwork could be an option. However, I am mindful that it is not the purpose of the appeal process to evolve a scheme, and it is therefore important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the Council. I have therefore proceeded to determine the appeal on the basis of the plans as originally submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the conservation area and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, the Duke of Cambridge public house.

Reasons

4. The appeal site, which forms part of the terrace of three mid-later Victorian houses, is a residential property located in the Battersea Park Conservation Area (BPCA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 (the Act) requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
5. The special character of the BPCA designation derives from the formal relationship between the Battersea Park, the urban development surrounding it, and the River Thames to the north. The urban development is characterised by the traditionally designed houses with distinctive architectural detailing and traditional materials.
6. The BPCA Appraisal and Management Strategy (AMS) states that the appeal property is one of two terraces of three properties along Battersea Bridge Road. It is two storeys in height with basement, and it is finished with yellow stock brick

construction terminating at roof level in a parapet. The Venetian window on the first-floor front elevation is also highlighted in the AMS.

7. Within the vicinity of the appeal site, there is a Grade II listed building, Assemblies of the First Born Church, which is constructed in polychrome red / yellow brick in a diamond pattern above Gothic arched windows. The AMS states that this listed building dominates the townscape of this part of the conservation area.
8. A locally listed building, the Duke of Cambridge public house, lies at the corner of Battersea Bridge Road and Banbury Street. The public house is a three-storey building of yellow stock brick construction, and it has timber sash windows arched with keystone to the Battersea Bridge Road elevation.
9. All of the above contribute, particularly the high quality of the architecture, to the significance and special interest of the Battersea Bridge Road, which is also a part of the significance of the BPCA as a whole.
10. The proposed roof extension would be partially obscured by the existing parapet. The ridgeline of the proposed extension would be lower than the parapet of the Duke of Cambridge public house and the ridgeline of the adjoining property, No 236 Battersea Bridge Road. However, the appeal proposal would be large in scale, and it would also occupy the entire length of the host property. Therefore, it would create an alien feature dominating the character and appearance of the host building. The adverse effect would be exacerbated by the raised party walls and the use of metal cladding. Furthermore, the new windows within the extension would not align with those below on the front elevation of the host property.
11. The proposed roof extension would also be partly on the main rear slope. The overall scale, bulk, height and width would be excessive in this location. As the existing butterfly roof would be altered, the design of the roof extension would be at odds with the original roof form. Consequently, the proposal would result in an inappropriate and unsympathetic addition to the host property. I accept that the proposal would be situated at the rear elevation, however, as I observed on site views of the rear of the appeal site are available from public vantage points specifically on Banbury Street.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention on a number of examples in the area. No 242 Battersea Bridge Road lies at the corner of Colestown Street and Battersea Bridge Road, therefore its siting with the surrounding properties is different. No 232 Battersea Bridge Road is immediately adjacent to the appeal site, however, there is little detail of the suggested planning approval, therefore I cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. With regard to the rear extension approved to No 234, I have little information of this scheme. Nevertheless, a rear extension and an upward extension differ in terms of their effect on the character and appearance of the property, therefore such approved scheme would only be given limited weight. The aerial view provided shows some properties along Banbury Street have a roof extension. However, I find that they are not directly comparable, as they are not seen in the same context. In addition, the design approach of these properties is different. Furthermore, the windows on their roof extension align with those of their host building. As such, these developments sit more comfortably in their surroundings. By contrast the proposed roof extension would be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

13. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace of these Victorian houses, and the BPCA. As such the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the BPCA. Due to the scale and nature of the proposed development, the harm to the heritage asset would be less than substantial.
14. The approach in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to a heritage asset, as in this case, that harm should be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal.
15. I note that the proposal would provide a larger accommodation in a sustainable location, and the size of the accommodation would also meet the requirements, which are set out in the Nationally Described Space Standard and the London Plan. It would also provide an accommodation with adequate access to natural daylight and outlook, while it would retain the existing chimney between the appeal property and the adjoining building No. 236. Furthermore, the scheme would continue to secure the residential use to this property and there would also be some economic benefits associated with the construction work incorporating the sustainable construction measures. However, these benefits are limited by the small scale of the scheme before me. The Framework indicates that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. I therefore find that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the less than substantial harm identified, leading to conflict with the historic environment protection policies of the Framework.
16. Paragraph 216 of the Framework confirms that the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage should be taken into account in determining an application. A balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Although The Ridgeline of the proposed extension would be lower than the parapet of the Duke of Cambridge public house, due to its substantial scale and inappropriate design, the proposal would harm the significance of the Duke of Cambridge public house, a non-designated heritage asset.
17. Overall, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the BPCA and would therefore conflict with s72(1) of the Act. It would also be harmful to the significance of the Duke of Cambridge public house. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023). It would also conflict with the guidance within the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) and the AMS. These seek for development, amongst other things, to protect designated heritage assets from proposals that would adversely affect their significance. These policies also seek to achieve high quality design that respect the scale and character of the host building and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

18. Battersea Bridge Road separates the appeal site and the Grade II listed building, the Assemblies of the First Born Church. The special interest and significance of the listed Church is derived in part from its architectural interest, historic fabric and building materials. Notwithstanding the appeal site proximate to this listed Church and there is some intervisibility between the two, in my judgement, the appeal

proposal would preserve the setting of the Assemblies of the First Born Church, the significance of which would not be harmed.

19. I am also aware that the site is situated within an Archaeological Priority Area, and the AMS states the area was mainly laid out as strip fields for farming and grazing during the medieval period. This pattern remained largely unaltered until 1846. I note that the Council has no objection in this regard due to the nature of the proposal. Also, an upward extension does not raise archaeological concerns. Consequently, I find no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions on this matter. Therefore, the compliance with the development plan in this respect is a neutral factor.
20. The site is situated within flood zone 2 and 3b. The Council does not raise any objections to the proposal, in terms of flood risk. As an upward extension would be unlikely to raise any flood risk concerns, therefore, the compliance with the development plan in this respect is a neutral factor.
21. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under this planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

22. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

O Tresaie

INSPECTOR