



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2025

By G Powys Jones FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3367449

Flat 7, Vicarage Mansions, Queenstown Road, London, SW8 3RZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Darren Reeve of Charter Property Development Ltd against the London Borough of Wandsworth (Wandsworth Council).
 - The application Ref is 2025/0648.
 - The development proposed is alterations including erection of mansard roof extension to create additional floor of accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary and procedural matters

2. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted the description of the proposed development used in the Council's registration letter rather than that used in the original application form.
3. The Council issued its decision notice on 16 June 2025, and I have read the parties' accounts of the communications between them at around that time. I am satisfied the notice was not issued prior to the appeal being made and am therefore content that the appeal should proceed on a non-determination basis.
4. This being the case, I shall take into account the amendments to the scheme submitted to the Council prior to the appeal's submission, and the Council has had the opportunity to comment on them as part of the appeal proceedings. No party's interests would be prejudiced if we proceed accordingly, particularly since I have been made fully aware of the Council's stance on the proposal.
5. The appeal property is located within the Parktown Estate Conservation Area (CA). Just to the north of the appeal property on the opposite side of the street, St Philip Square, is a church which lends its name to the square. This is a building listed as being of architectural or historic importance (LB) (*Grade II*).

Main Issues

6. The main issues are whether the proposal would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and the effect of the development on the setting of the LB.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a substantial brick-built building, partly four- and partly three-storey situated on the corner of Queenstown Road and St Philip Square. I found that the foliage on mature trees screens much of the building when viewed from the north, although I suspect that it would become more prominent in those winter months when full defoliation has taken place. Due to its height on the corner and its 'book-end' townscape function, its upper floors are particularly noticeable in the street scene when viewed from the south along Queenstown Road, from parts of Thackeray Street to the east, and from Prairie Street to the west.
8. I regard it as a prominent building, contributing positively to this part of the CA which displays distinct Victorian characteristics. Indeed, judging from the maps in the CA Appraisal, it was amongst one of the earliest properties built in the area. The roof of the tallest part of the building is concealed by a parapet. The several chimney stacks with their large intact pots¹ are attractive features on the building at this level, contributing to the largely well preserved roofscape in this part of the CA.
9. The intention is to add another floor on this corner. This would take the form of a vertical mansard projection, punctuated by window openings in the form of dormers. Some chimneys stacks would be retained, and others removed. The parapet would remain in place since the original proposal to raise it where the building adjoins 2 St Philip Square to accommodate a staircase was omitted as part of the late amendments to the scheme.
10. Policy LP4 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (WLP) is a policy directed to the development of Tall and Mid Rise Buildings (MRBs). In essence, the addition of the mansard in the manner proposed would increase the height of the building to qualify it as a MRB for the purposes of the policy. The Council seeks to restrict the heights of buildings within certain defined areas, and the increased height proposed would breach the terms of the policy.
11. The appellant does not seriously dispute that the policy is breached but considers that other factors should be taken into account. Firstly, that buildings opposite the site could be said to be 5-storey on account of their mansards; secondly, that the proposed mansard would not project significantly above the existing parapet.
12. As the appellant suggests, the proposed mansard could not be seen when standing close to the building². However, from other close and medium range viewing points it would be plainly noticeable, particularly in conjunction with the loss of fabric due to the removal of chimneys. The appellant acknowledges that the loss of any historic fabric needs careful consideration, but on balance he considers that sustainability objectives combined with enhanced amenity for future occupiers tipped the balance in favour of removing the most compromising chimneys whilst retaining 40% of the existing chimney stacks. I shall return to issues relating to sustainability, energy conservation and maintenance later in addressing the planning balance.
13. The examples of local development displaying mansard roofs cited by the appellant are clearly distinguishable in heritage terms from the appeal proposal. They are part and parcel of the original building designs which have been in place for several

¹ Some of which appeared to me to be larger than shown on the submitted drawings

² The appellant suggests within 50 feet of the building.

generations and are therefore integral to local heritage. The add-on proposed here, taken in combination with the loss of historic fabric, would be seen and perceived as a modern intrusion in the CA and as injurious to local visual amenity, particularly to a historic roofscape which has remained consistent in its appearance for over a century and a half.

14. The appeal property clearly forms part of the LB's setting. The quality of the setting has remained constant for a considerable period of time and it is one which to my mind deserves protection. The locally distinctive roofscape contributes positively to the LB's setting, and whilst the loss of fabric involved may be limited, I regard the erosion of part of the attractive and significant roofscape as harmful to the LBs setting.
15. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the CA and the setting of the LB. Accordingly, I find that a material conflict arises with those provisions of WLP policy LP3 providing that development affecting the historic environment should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Council's conservation areas and the setting of its heritage assets.

Planning balance

16. The appellant's submissions point to what are regarded as the many advantages of the scheme in justification, and that these should be balanced against any disadvantages of the scheme. In summary, the main advantages are regarded as the removal of old building fabric in the case of the roof and its replacement with a new structure, which would improve the building's insulation, energy efficiency, water tightness and make for easier general maintenance, especially regarding leaf clearance. The removal of some of the chimneys is promoted on a largely similar basis.
17. I can understand the benefits of the scheme to the appellant, but I do not regard the public benefits as significant. Accordingly, and though I find the harm to the setting of the LB to be less than substantial, this is not outweighed by any discernible public benefit. The benefits arising to the appellant from the scheme do not justify the harm caused to the character and appearance of the CA.

Other matters

18. The references to the *National Planning Policy Framework* have been taken into account. Other development plan policies have been referred to, but those to which I have referred are considered the most relevant.
19. I have considered the representations made by local residents, by the Wandsworth Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee, the Clapham Society and the Battersea Society. The various references to the use of the building are noted, but this has played little or no part in my considerations.
20. No other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh those considerations which led to my conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR