
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025

by **P Burley BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3365565

9 Hollies Way, Temperley Road, Wandsworth, London SW12 8QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Bramfield Studio against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0550.
 - The development proposed is described as follows: 'The proposed works will involve the enlargement of an existing single storey studio dwelling. The enlargement will consist of the construction of one additional storey immediately above the roof of the existing property in accordance with Permitted Development. The additional storey shall be constructed only on the principal part (existing roof) of the dwellinghouse.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the construction of one additional storey immediately above the roof of the existing property in accordance with Permitted Development. The additional storey shall be constructed only on the principal part (existing roof) of the dwellinghouse at 9 Hollies Way, Temperley Road, Wandsworth, London SW12 8QG in accordance with application 2025/0550 and the details submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether prior approval should be granted, having particular regard to the effect of the external appearance of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Where an existing dwellinghouse consists of one storey, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) permits the construction of one additional storey together with any engineering operations reasonably necessary for the purpose of that construction, subject to a number of limitations and conditions.
4. The Council concluded that the appeal scheme complies with the requirements of Class AA and would be permitted development, subject to paragraph AA.2. (3) which sets out a number of matters for which prior approval must be sought.

5. In respect of those matters the Council concluded that the appeal scheme would be acceptable in terms of potential impacts on the amenity of any adjoining premises, air traffic and defence asset impacts, and protected views. Based on the information before me I concur.
6. However, and in relation to Condition AA.2. (3)(a)(ii), the Council stated that the design and appearance of the proposed development, by reason of its scale and siting, would be a visually-prominent, intrusive and incongruous addition to the terraced property, detrimentally detracting from the local spatial character.
7. Whilst the Council referred to development plan policies in its decision, given that the principle of development has been established through the grant of permission by the GPDO, prior approval appeals are not determined on the basis of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. However, I have taken the development plan policies into account insofar as they are relevant to the prior approval matters under consideration.
8. The use of the word 'including' in Condition AA.2. (3)(a)(ii) indicates that it does not set out a closed list and other factors may be taken into account. Therefore, it is a matter of planning judgment as to whether consideration is given solely to the effect of the development on the design of the dwellinghouse and / or the effect on its relationship with the wider area. Given the orientation of the appeal site and given that it forms part of a larger development, I consider that the proposal should not be considered in isolation and that the wider context is relevant.
9. The appeal site is located on and accessed from Hollies Way, a pedestrian precinct which runs parallel to Temperley Road. It forms part of a terrace of properties, all of which are single-storey except for the easternmost property to which an additional storey has been added. That property is clad in wood at first floor level and the ground storey is painted grey.
10. The Temperley Road façades of most of the other properties in the terrace are faced with a light-coloured brick and wood cladding, and the walls below each window are painted. There is a wide white fascia board between the top of the windows and the flat roofs. There are grassed areas surrounded by low metal fences to the south of most of the Temperley Road façades.
11. However, the property to the immediate east of the appeal site – which also forms part of the single-storey terrace – has a markedly different appearance when viewed from Temperley Road. It has been re-clad in a brick which is a different colour to its neighbours, it does not have a fascia board, a door has been added and the pattern of fenestration changed, and the grassed area to its south has been enclosed with a wall and fence to create a private garden.
12. There are two four-storey blocks of residential accommodation which were built at the same time as, and which sit above and perpendicular to, the terrace. The ground floors of these blocks are faced in a dark brown brick and the upper floors have been re-clad with white pre-fabricated panels. The appeal site is one of four of the terraced properties which sit between and separate these blocks.
13. Overall, a series of permitted changes have materially altered the external appearance, and diminished the visual cohesiveness, of the estate of which the appeal site forms part.

14. Buildings on the southern side of Temperley Road opposite the appeal site are a mixture of terraced, semi-detached and detached two- or three-storey dwellinghouses. Whilst they display a range of characteristics that are common in Victorian-era properties, they are varied in design and external appearance and do not have a single / consistent roof line. Some of these dwellings are faced with stock brick and others are rendered and painted in a range of colours. Overall, the character of the immediate area is one of variety rather than uniformity.
15. Given the varied surroundings I have considered how the appeal scheme would be perceived from various locations in the local area.
16. The additional storey would be largely screened from longer-distance views along Temperley Road by the four-storey blocks such that it would only become visible at close range. Even then it would be read against those taller blocks. In that context I do not consider that it would be prominent and visually over-bearing.
17. The appeal site, together with a large part of the adjoining estate, can also be seen from Balham Grove where the contrast between the two-storey appeal scheme and its single-storey neighbours would be most appreciable.
18. From Balham Grove the appeal site is seen in the context of a large tree which sits between the single-storey terrace and Temperley Road. However, the Council has stated that this would only partially shield the extension from view from some angles during the summer months, would provide little-to-no shielding during winter, and is not protected by a tree preservation order.
19. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the tree would be removed and, even in winter, I consider that it would act as a visual break in the gap between the two four-storey blocks. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that trees can die or be removed and, therefore, this has not been a determinative factor in my decision.
20. Even if the tree was removed the appeal site and the other three single-storey dwellings which sit between the two four-storey blocks would only be seen together from the northern part of Balham Grove and in a view framed by a variety of different building forms and street trees. Whilst the additional floor on the appeal site could appear to be asymmetrical, in the context of changes that have already been made to the wider host building and taking into account the varied streetscape, I do not consider that this would result in the appeal scheme detracting from the local spatial character or that it would result in a harmful relationship with the wider area such that approval should be withheld.
21. Accordingly, I consider that the appeal scheme complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) and the guidance in the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) insofar as they are relevant to this appeal.

Other Matters

22. The occupiers of a neighbouring dwelling have raised various issues including noise and disturbance during construction, structural concerns and Party Wall matters. However, I am constrained by the GPDO in relation to what I can consider and therefore these matters cannot be determinative in this appeal.

Conditions

23. Planning permission granted for development under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO is subject to the conditions set out in paragraph AA.2. of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

P Burley

INSPECTOR