



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/24/3353629

67 Flat B, Bolingbroke Grove, Wandsworth, London SW11 6HE

- 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 Ms Kerrigan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2516.
 - The development proposed is new additional floor with mansard roof, new window and doors with a new glazed dormer within rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Although no one was able to allow me access into the appeal property at the time of my visit, I was able to view this from the adjacent highway.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and whether this would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area ('CA').

Reasons

4. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, places a duty to require special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the special character or appearance of a conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') requires me to assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal.
5. The appeal property, which does not appear to have been subject to any significant alterations, forms part of a terrace of four properties, 64-67 Bolingbroke Grove, which is located within the Wandsworth Common CA. In particular, these properties fall within Character Area J: Bolingbroke Grove of the Wandsworth Common CA. This part of the conservation area is characterised by the grid pattern of residential streets, often open ended to Wandsworth Common. Bolingbroke Grove contains a variety of mainly three-storey detached and semi-detached buildings as well as short terraces, and some modern infill flatted development.
6. On the information before me, the conservation area appraisal identifies 64-79 Bolingbroke Grove as: "three-storey red brick Victorian terraced properties with

gabled frontages above projecting two-storey canted bay windows. Classical detailing around the windows and engaged columned porches, some with cast iron railings to the balconies above add richness to the details.”

7. Based on the above and my observations, the significance of Character Area J: Bolingbroke Grove, lies within the arrangement of its buildings and the quality of their similar forms and architecture. Together, the appeal property and similar nearby properties, contribute positively to the generally cohesive street scene, roofscapes and the traditional character and appearance of the Wandsworth Common CA.
8. Because the appeal property is an end terrace it is particularly prominent and sensitive to change.
9. The proposed dormer would be set in from the sides and is in the form of a largely glazed box. The simplicity of its form, modern design and significant amount of glazing, would limit its visual impact and allow it to be read as a subordinate and modern addition to the appeal property. Also, its form and design reflect a similar dormer extension to the rear of 68 Bramfield Road.
10. In contrast, and despite the use of matching materials, the proposed mansard extension would extend along the full width and depth of the rear outrigger. Although the height of this extension would remain below the ridge of the main roof of the appeal property, this introduces an additional storey of accommodation on the outrigger, which would have an erosive effect on its otherwise subservient form. The limited amount of glazing, particularly on the side elevation to Bramfield Road would do little to break up the significant mass of this extension. Furthermore, the increase in height of the party wall arising from this extension, would result in an awkward relationship with the adjoining terrace and would also unbalance the symmetry between these.
11. In views west along Bramfield Road, the overall scale of the mansard roof extension would obscure the dormer extension. Also, the traditional form of the mansard extension would not integrate with the contemporary design of the proposed dormer.
12. Notwithstanding some limited variations, the appeal property and the terrace that it forms a part of are distinctive because of their similar forms, including the two-storey outriggers. As such, the mansard extension would be an atypical and sizeable addition in a prominent location, which does not accord with the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (November 2016).
13. Most of Bramfield Road is outside the Wandsworth Common CA. However, more immediately, the proposed development would be seen from this road to the side of the appeal site from within the Wandsworth Common CA. The proposed development would also be visible from parts of Bolingbroke Grove, albeit such views would be only available from a short section of this road. As such, and notwithstanding the more limited visibility of the proposed development from Wandsworth Common itself, the proposal would be viewed as an uncharacteristic addition to the appeal property.
14. For the above reasons, the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and harms the character

and appearance of the Wandsworth Common CA. Having regard to the Framework, I assess the level of harm to be less than substantial.

15. The Framework advises that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would improve the quality of accommodation at the appeal property through the increase in internal floorspace and improvements in its thermal performance and natural ventilation, which would mainly benefit its occupiers. Also, there is nothing to suggest that the improvements in thermal performance and ventilation could not be achieved through other acceptable alterations to the appeal property. Nonetheless, I acknowledge that these improvements also align with the aspirations of both local and national planning policies and therefore are capable of being public benefits. Irrespective, given the modest scale of the proposal (extensions to a single property) the benefits arising from this would be limited.
16. Consequently, the public benefits that would arise from the proposal do not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset, to which the Framework states great weight should be afforded.
17. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038. Together and amongst other matters, these policies require proposals to sustain, preserve and wherever possible, enhance the significance of any heritage asset. Accordingly, the proposal is also contrary to the aims of the Framework for conserving and enhancing heritage assets.

Other Matters

18. I have been referred to other developments in the area, including at 76 Bolingbroke Grove. This incorporates a mansard roof extension above the existing outrigger. On the information before me, this predates the current local, London and national policy documents and the designation of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area. Irrespective, this does not reflect the prevailing character of the Wandsworth Common CA, where generally similar rear outriggers are two storeys and free of any significant additions. Also, the scheme at 76 Bolingbroke Grove is not directly comparable to the proposal before me, which also incorporates a dormer extension.
19. The circumstances of other mansard extensions in the area, such as those at 31-35 Bolingbroke Grove are also different to the scheme before me as they only marginally increased the height of the rear outriggers and are on properties of a different style to the appeal property. As such, these other developments add limited support to the proposal.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR