



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3365293

120 Tyneham Road, Wandsworth, London SW11 5XR

- 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 Thomas Harries against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0014.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension to main roof to provide an additional storey of accommodation.
-

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 main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Shaftesbury Park Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The significance of the CA largely derives from its origins as an estate built by the 'Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Company', a housing co-operative founded in 1867 by William Austin, who was determined to build decent accommodation for the working classes. It consists mainly of parallel rows of terraced housing laid out in a regimented fashion. Properties within the estate are generally two-storeys and constructed in London stock brick. They often have red and black banded arches as well as gothic detailing which emphasises features such as porches, canopies and door arches.
5. The appeal dwelling reflects this character, it being a mid-terrace, two-storey dwelling with materials and gothic detailing consistent with those of the wider terrace. The terrace also has a butterfly roofscape and this is largely screened to the front by a parapet wall which provides for an overriding consistency to the roof line. The prevailing uniformity in architectural style across the terrace including its roof line gives the Tyneham Road street scene much distinctiveness which adds to the significance of the CA.

6. The Wandsworth Local Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) includes guidance on alterations to roofs and loft conversions and identifies that in conservation areas it will be most important to preserve the original appearance of those parts of the house that can most easily be seen from the street and the way the house contributes to the street scene. It also recognises that roofs of early/mid Victorian terraced houses are often entirely concealed behind parapets, appearing as flat roofs from ground level and that architectural features that are characteristic of the historic period of the house should be retained.
7. Due to its boxy form, contrasting lead cladding facing material and protrusion significantly above the top of the parapet, the roof extension would not complement the distinctive architectural detailing of the terrace. Even accounting for its position set back from the parapet, it would be highly discernible for anyone approaching the site along Ashbury Road as is evidenced by the similarly designed roof extension to the immediately adjoining dwelling at 122 Tyneham Road (No 122). In the case of the appeal proposal the visual impact would be even more pronounced given its more central position facing Ashbury Road and the cumulative effect seen alongside the extension at No 122. As a result, the proposal would unacceptably erode the originality of the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the CA.
8. My attention has been drawn to a limited number of examples of similar roof extensions including those nearby at Nos 114, 116 and 122 Tyneham Road. However, from what I saw, the originality of the terrace otherwise remains largely intact. The limited number of such extensions does not, therefore, justify the proposal which for the reasons already outlined would erode the distinctive qualities of the terrace, particularly its prevailing uniformity. As such, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the significance of the CA.
9. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Given the scale of the proposal, the harm to the significance of the CA would be towards the lower end of less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, I must attach great weight to conservation of the CA. Whilst enhanced living accommodation would be provided, in the context of a single dwelling this would not amount to public benefits sufficient to outweigh the identified harm to the CA.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with the requirements in policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) for development to have a high level of physical integration with its surroundings, to complement the form, setting, period and detailing of the host building and to preserve the significance, appearance, character, function and setting of heritage assets. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the requirements to conserve and enhance the historic environment in the NPPF and the guidance in the SPD.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

K Hole APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR