



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2025

by **SE Hughes BA (Hons) PGDip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3361896
26A Blakett Street, London SW15 1QG

- 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 Dr Georgina Margiotta against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/3603.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 29 July 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form has been altered by the Council. The evidence that I have before me does not provide details of the appellant's agreement to change the development description, therefore I have used the description of development provided on the application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - character and appearance of the area; and
 - living conditions of the occupiers of No 53, No 55 and 57 Bangalore Street, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (WLP) require residential extensions to be of high design quality, which are subservient to the original host dwelling and sympathetic in style.
5. The 'Wandsworth Local Plan: Supplementary Planning Document: Housing' Adopted November 2016 (SPD) requires extensions to respect the shape and form of the existing house and not be over dominant. Furthermore, the SPD indicates that hipped roofs on end of terraced houses must always be retained. In addition, it states that on corner houses, which are clearly visible from the street, where it is

considered acceptable to create a gabled roof, it should not be combined with a mansard style addition at the rear.

6. The appeal property is located in a residential area comprising rows of terraced and semi-detached houses on the corner of Blackett Street and Bangalore Street. The appeal property features a distinctive hipped roof end, corresponding with the opposite end of the terrace. Whilst it is not possible to view both ends of the terrace at the same time, the hipped roof end balances the terrace and enriches the character of the area. As such, the hipped roof end represents an important roof feature in the local area.
7. The appeal proposal comprises a L-shaped loft development encompassing a hip to gable extension and a mansard roof extension above part of an existing two-storey rear addition.
8. The proposed roof extension would be a substantial addition to the roof of the appeal property. Whilst roof extensions are not unusual in the locality, by reason of the roof extension's position at the end of the terrace and its scale, mass and form, it would be a dominant and discordant feature which would be highly visible in views along Bangalore Street, despite its setback position beyond 28 Blackett Street.
9. Furthermore, the loss of the original hipped roof end would significantly disrupt the established architectural form of the appeal property and, in doing so, would harm the visual unity of the terrace as a whole.
10. I acknowledge that the development would be constructed of matching brickwork and tiles to match the rest of the property. However, matching materials alone do not make the development acceptable.
11. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with policies LP1 and LP5 of the WLP and the SPD.
12. In coming to this conclusion, I have considered the appellant's suggestion to reduce the angle of the rear wall of the mansard roof, however I consider that the proposal would still be an overly excessive addition to the appeal property which would erode the coherence and balance of the terrace, thus harming the character and appearance of the area.
13. I have also considered the appellant's assertion that 28 Blackett Street is the end, corner property, rather than the appeal property. However, on my site visit I could not see No 28 from Blackett Street, so the appeal property clearly stood out as the end property in the terrace from views along this street. Furthermore, from Bangalore Street, I saw that the appeal property clearly behaves as the end, corner property, rather than a mid-terrace property, since the property's roof is clearly visible above the flat roof of No 28.

Living conditions

14. Despite not being parallelly aligned with the terrace on Bangalore Street, the proposed extension would be highly visible from facing windows of No 53, No 55 and 57 Bangalore Street. Whilst they would be separated by the street and No 28, by virtue of their facing orientation, the raised height of the appeal property's end wall and its blank wall face would be an overbearing feature. As such the

development would unacceptably dominate the outlook of the facing windows of No 53, No 55 and 57 Bangalore Street.

15. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of dwellings of No 53, No 55 and 57 Bangalore Street with particular regard to outlook. As such, it would be contrary to Policy LP2 of the WLP which aims to protect occupants of existing properties from overbearing development.

Other Matters

16. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to other corner properties and end of terrace properties in the surrounding area that have already been extended in a similar manner to that proposed. I do not know the full circumstances of all of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. I also note that the parties disagree as to whether any involved the replacement of a hipped roof end with a gable end. In any event, those that I saw on my site visit, served to confirm that they have been disruptive to the harmony of the roofscape, and that they have damaged the relationship between the rows of terraces, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, whilst I accept these developments have adjusted the area's character, I do not consider that it should justify a further erosion of the character that would arise from the appeal proposal.
17. I understand the wishes of the appellant to provide additional space within their existing property, to improve their residential amenity. I also acknowledge the proposal would optimise the density of the appeal site. However, I do not consider that these matters or any others raised outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

SE Hughes

INSPECTOR