



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3359072

5 Westhorpe Road, Wandsworth, London SW15 1QH

- 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 & Mrs Menon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2585.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing outrigger loft dormer and internal remodelling.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the host dwelling with particular regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace residential property set in a 'U' shaped block consisting of one side of Westhorpe Road, one side of Borneo Street and a section of Hotham Road. The rear elevations of properties within the block have a consistent pattern of two storey rear additions with simple pitched roofs which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Their uniformity is particularly noticeable from the public realm on Bangalore Street.
5. Many of the main roofs in the vicinity of the appeal property have flat roof rear dormer extensions, and some have a further flat roof dormer extension part way over the two-storey rear addition. These elements are mostly read as subservient and do not disrupt the hierarchy or pattern of the pleasant and consistent two storey rear additions. Guidance within the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) sets out that dormer extensions on the rear additions up to 50% of their length are acceptable. However, the mass of an extension should respect the scale form and hierarchy of the rear addition and should not appear top heavy.

6. The appeal proposal would extend an existing short rear roof dormer on the rear addition to almost its full length. This would introduce a form and massing that, taken cumulatively with the existing roof extensions to the property, would visually dominate its roofscape, thereby interrupting the hierarchy and legibility of the two-storey rear addition and failing to enhance or relate positively to the prevailing local character.
7. I acknowledge that there are extensions at 4 Westhorpe Road and 8 Borneo Street which have similar full length roof extensions to the appeal proposal. However, information before me indicates that these were constructed under permitted development rights, although I do not have the specific details of this. They are therefore not directly comparable with the appeal proposal for which planning permission has been applied.
8. I have also had my attention drawn to other rear addition roof extensions within nearby blocks. However, they are set within in a different context to the appeal proposal. Moreover, rather than providing justification for the appeal proposal, if anything, their presence points to a need for such proposals to be carefully controlled if the character and appearance of the area is to be safeguarded. Additionally, I have little information relating to the particular circumstances of these developments and whether they are directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. Nonetheless, I have considered that a fallback position may exist under permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) Regulations 2015 (as amended) for a similar development to that of the appeal scheme. However, I have not been provided with any details of the permitted development right which would be exercised. Consequently, I am unable to conclude whether this offers a realistic or probable prospect and therefore it does not represent a legitimate fallback position. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal on the basis of what is proposed and its effects.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (2023) (Local Plan), the SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Which seek to secure high quality design that enhances and relates positively to local character and in the case of roof extensions is sympathetic to the style of building in keeping with local character.
11. In their decision notice the Council refer to Local Plan Policy LP2 of the in relation to this main issue, but this policy relates to amenity. Therefore, it has not been a determinative factor in reaching my recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR