
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3361411

125A Allfarthing Lane, Wandsworth, London SW18 2AU

- 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 Dawn June Gibbons against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/3969.
 - The proposed development is described as: 'The erection of a I-shape mansard loft conversion with an increase to the ridge height of 250mm, new parapet walls, 2x velux on the front elevation and 2x skylights on the roof. The creation of a roof terrace. The modification of 3x windows on the first floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at 123 and 127 Allfarthing Lane, and 6 and 8 Delia Street, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Allfarthing Lane and surrounding roads comprise two-storey terraced houses with hipped roof two-storey additions at the rear. 125A Allfarthing Lane is located at the first floor of a mid-terraced property, with 125 Allfarthing Lane at ground floor level. At my site visit, I observed a variety of roof extensions and roof terraces at the rear of these properties. However, these structures are noticeably set back from their eaves, as such, their original architectural features remain intact, and they contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the general uniformity of buildings also gives a consistent and cohesive character in the area.
4. The Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Housing November 2016 (SPD) advises that the length of the roof extensions to rear 'back additions' should be restricted to only 50% of the length of the back addition. It also advises that care should be taken over the design, placement and size of the

new structure in order that it respects the scale, form and hierarchy of the rear addition and avoids appearing top-heavy.

5. The proposed mansard roof would be positioned at the corner of the existing roof planes at the rear. Whilst the proposed mansard roof itself would be shorter than the existing hipped roof of the rear addition, its length would exceed half the length of the rear addition. Furthermore, the roof terrace would extend to the end of the hipped roof. As such, it would create a bulky and top-heavy feature that would detract from the established character of the area.
6. I appreciate that the appeal site is located within a close-grained pattern of development, as such, views of the proposed roof extension would be limited to specific vantage points. However, unlike other roof extensions locally, the proposal would significantly alter the existing roof form. Consequently, the proposal would result in an incongruous addition that would diminish the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings. The use of materials to match those on the existing building would be insufficient to overcome the incongruous design of the proposal.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a roof alteration at 106 Beechcroft Road¹. Whilst I do not have full details of the scheme, the style of the building in that case is different from the appeal property, and the street context is not comparable to Allfarthing Lane. Consequently, the existence of this development, which is some distance from the appeal site in any event, does not persuade me that the appeal scheme is acceptable.
8. The appellant mentioned several types of roof alterations or extensions in the area. I have not been provided with full details of these cases. Notwithstanding that, I observed that roof alterations and extensions in the surrounding area are generally set back from the eaves. As such, the original architectural features of those buildings are adequately maintained.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023 (Local Plan). Taken together, these seek that development is designed to a high standard and is in keeping with the character of the area.

Living Conditions

10. The houses on Allfarthing Lane runs parallel to terraced housing on Delia Street. The gardens of properties on both Allfarthing Lane and Delia Street are short. The proposed roof extension would be visible from the rear windows of 6 and 8 Delia Street. It would also be visible from the rear gardens of 123 and 127 Allfarthing Lane.
11. The proposed mansard roof would not be modest in scale, and the rear elevation of the main building, Nos 125 and 125A, is readily visible from the rear-facing windows of the neighbouring properties on Delia Street. Given the short distance between the appeal proposal and the neighbours' windows, the overall bulk and massing of the proposal would result in an overbearing effect on the occupiers of 6 and 8 Delia Street. In addition, the top-heavy form of the roof extension would

¹ APP/H5960/D/24/3341706, decision issued 30 July 2024.

appear visually dominant when viewed from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties at 123 and 127 Allfarthing Lane, thereby contributing further to the overbearing impact. The adverse effect would be exacerbated by the lack of set-back.

12. Whilst no objections have been received from neighbours, it does not alter my conclusion on this main issue.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties at 123 and 127 Allfarthing Lane and 6 and 8 Delia Street. The proposal would conflict with Policy LP2 of the Local Plan. This policy, amongst other matters, seeks to protect the amenity of the existing and future occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has drawn my attention to several development plan policies. Local Plan Policy LP31 covers all forms of housing for vulnerable people and older people defined in use classes C2 and C3 and directly responds to London Plan policies and H12 (Supported and specialised accommodation) and H13 (Specialist older persons housing). These policies emphasise the need for accessible and adaptable housing solutions to accommodate changing demographics and ensure people can remain in their homes rather than being forced to relocate due to inaccessibility. Local Plan Policy LP15 promotes and supports development that help residents to lead healthy and active lifestyles by including measures to reduce health and well-being inequality.
15. I have carefully considered the reasons why the appellant has applied for planning permission for the proposed development. I have no doubt that the proposed development would result in improvements in living conditions for the appellant. In particular, the appellant indicates that the proposal would comply with the accessibility standards, which would be subject to Building Regulation requirements, to ensure long term wheelchair accessibility and would also facilitate the appellant's independent living at this appeal property. These are circumstances to which I attribute moderate weight in favour of the appeal.
16. In weighing such circumstances in the planning balance, these benefits must be considered against the significant adverse effects that would arise in terms of the effects on the character and appearance of area and the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. The benefits do not therefore outweigh the harms. I note that the appellant solely owns the entire property, No 125 and No 125A, but this does not have any weight in my decision.
17. Accordingly, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires me to consider the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Protected characteristics include a person's age and disability.
18. In respect of the above, a refusal of planning permission is a proportionate, and necessary approach to the legitimate aims of ensuring that developments are appropriately designed and do not harm the character and appearance of the main building and the area, or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

19. Furthermore, the protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering of the rights of the appellant. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge these personal circumstances, this is not a matter that outweighs the harm that would be caused by the proposed development in respect of my conclusions on the main issues.

Conclusion

The proposed development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

O Tresa

INSPECTOR