



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/24/3356005

219 Sellincourt Road, London SW17 9SD

- 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 Anuara Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2892.
 - The development proposed is alterations including erection of roof extension above two storey back addition.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's Decision Notice as this is a more accurate description of the proposed development.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on 1) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and 2) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property is a mid-terraced two storey dwelling located within a residential area with dwellings of a similar size and style. The rear elevations of the properties in the terrace mostly have a pleasant uniformity with predominantly two storey rear outriggers and simple pitched roofs which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal property has an existing ground floor rear extension, a rear flat roof dormer and a two-storey rear outrigger with a flat roof, in contrast to the mainly pitched roofs of the rear outriggers, characteristic of the terrace.

6. The proposal seeks to extend the second-floor roof extension over the majority of the width and length of the first-floor rear outrigger's flat roof at the same height as the existing roof extension and with a 0.2m set back and set in from the sides, amongst other things. The continuation of the roof at the existing roof extension height would fail to step down the heights and would create an uncharacteristic large visual mass to the rear elevation.
7. The vertical sides of the proposed roof extension on top of the existing first floor extension's vertical sides, would result in the appearance of an uncharacteristic vertical, bulky, top heavy and dominant rear extension over the first and second floors, contrary to the character of the terrace rear elevations. The rear roof extension would fail to sufficiently step in the width and down the height of development, would fail to respect the form, scale and hierarchy and would fail to be subservient to the host dwelling.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other developments in the area and the planning permissions relating to them. Whilst there are some flat roofed second floor extensions over a first-floor rear outrigger, these are mostly clearly set back from the length and sides of the first-floor rear outrigger, allowing a step-down effect. Also, these developments have mostly mansard style sloping sides, lower roof heights, compared to the main roof, or a combination of the two. Therefore, I differentiate those developments from the subject appeal and have formed my own views on the proposed development in terms of the individual planning merits. The other developments do not justify the harm I have identified.
9. I am aware that a Certificate for Lawful Development was granted at No. 204 for a similar scheme. However, that application was assessed under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), rather than under the policies of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) (the Local Plan) and guidance in the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (the SPD). It also relates to a different property. As such I differentiate that development from the current appeal and give it limited weight.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Local Plan. These policies require, amongst other things, that the scale, massing and appearance of development is of high quality and that residential extensions respect or compliment the form of the host building and be visually subservient to it. The proposed development would also be contrary to the guidance contained in the SPD relating to high quality design.

Living Conditions

11. Dwellings Number 221 (No 221) and Number 223 (No 223) are ground floor and first floor flats respectively, formed from an adjoining terraced dwelling. By their nature they are close; however, their rear outriggers are separated by a small distance at ground floor and a larger distance at first floor. Guidance in the SPD sets out that: *'Conversions/extensions which also include the roof of the 'back additions' of terraced houses can cause particular problems in terms of the impact on the adjoining property by reducing the amount of light to an already narrow space between two 'back additions'*.
12. In regard to the relationship with No 221 there is already a sense of overbearing to the kitchen/utility and the rear facing lounge/dining room window, due to its ground floor positioning, height and the close proximity of the rear outrigger at the appeal

property. However, the proposal would not significantly increase this compared to the existing situation.

13. At no. 223 I also acknowledge that the existing outrigger at the appeal property has an existing impact in terms of outlook from the closest habitable room windows. However, the increase in bulk and mass caused by the proposed development would significantly worsen the impact on living conditions when considered against the existing arrangement.
14. The appellant has highlighted that some of the rooms affected may not be habitable rooms; however, on my site visit I was able to see that the rearward facing room of No 223 is a habitable room and would be adversely affected.
15. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy LP2 of the Local Plan, which requires, amongst other things, that development proposals must not adversely impact the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of levels of light, visual intrusion and any overbearing impact. The proposed development would also be contrary to the guidance contained in the SPD.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge that there were no objections received to the proposed development from the occupants of the closest residential properties. The absence of such objections is, however, a neutral factor in the balance and does not weigh in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. 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

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR