



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3370900**

**43 Summerley Street, Wandsworth, London SW18 4EU**

- 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 Edward Church of London Heritage Properties against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application reference is 2024/4336.
  - The development proposed is alterations to the existing two self-contained flats, including the erection of a single-storey rear and side extension to the ground-floor flat, construction of a rear L-shaped mansard roof extension to create an additional self-contained flat, and formation of 1.7m high opaque glass screen balconies for the first and second-floor flats.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matters

2. A development has been permitted<sup>1</sup> by the Council since the refusal by them of the appeal proposal. It is understood from the evidence before me that this differs only insofar as it omits the appeal proposal's rear balconies. At the time of my site visit I noted that the permission has been part implemented.
3. The Council officer's report for the appeal proposal had raised concerns in relation to the proposed balconies failing to provide the minimum private outdoor space requirement detailed in a development plan policy<sup>2</sup>. I invited comments from both main parties on this matter, and it has been clarified by the Council that this is not determinative and there is common ground between them and the appellant on all matters except for the effect of the proposed balconies on the character and appearance of the building and its setting within the terrace. I have no evidence before me to indicate that I should adopt a contrary position.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed balconies on the character and appearance of the building and its setting within the terrace.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

5. The host dwelling at the appeal site dates from the late nineteenth century, constructed as a split-level house of two storeys at the front and three storeys at

---

<sup>1</sup> Council reference 2025/1255

<sup>2</sup> Policy LP27 of the London Borough of Wandsworth Local Plan (2023)

the rear. It sits within a terrace of very similar buildings, clearly planned and constructed at the same time and typical of medium sized suburban dwellings of this period in southwestern London, close to commuter railway stations.

6. Despite subdivisions into flats, other interventions such as replacement windows, and no conservation area designation or listings, the terrace retains much of its original aesthetic and architectural values. My observations from the appeal site's rear garden and a fleeting glimpse from a train travelling on the railway line atop the embankment to the rear, revealed that none of the buildings within the terrace featured balconies such as those proposed.
7. The proposed balconies would be at the rear of the building at 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor levels. The 1<sup>st</sup> floor balcony would be partly accommodated within the volume of a proposed single storey, hipped roofed, ground floor extension. The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony is proposed to sit directly above the 1<sup>st</sup> floor balcony, and entirely project from the host building's rear elevation. As a result, all of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony's balustrading would be visible outside of the volume of the main building. The obscure glazing would mean that the balustrading for both balconies would not be transparent, and their scale would be clearly apparent when viewed from neighbouring land, as would the contrast in appearance of the structures to the prevailing brickwork, slates and clear glazing that characterise the rear elevations of this terrace.
8. I acknowledge that the balconies would be subservient in scale to the host building and that the proposal does not bisect the 45-degree line taken from the midpoint of the neighbouring window at No 41 Summerley Street. Nevertheless, the extent of glazing that would be visible from neighbouring land and its incongruous appearance, at odds with the prevailing forms and material finishes, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and its setting within the terrace. It is particularly the juxtaposition of the proposed balconies and area of visible glazing, which would result in this level of harm. In this regard, there is a material difference in impact to the examples cited by the appellant in their evidence at No 34B Thorndean Street and No 20B Steerforth Street. I viewed these from Steerforth Street and examined the relevant plans included in an appendix to the appellant's statement. These balconies are both accommodated partly within the roof volumes of the respective buildings and, in the case of No 34B Thorndean Street, the balcony nestles between a raised brick parapet and a mansard roof.
9. For both of these examples, I acknowledge that they are visible from public receptors on Steerforth Street whereas, except for fleeting glimpses from passing trains, the balconies at the appeal site would only be visible from private land. This is a consideration that tempers the impact of the appeal proposal, but the level of significant harm that I have identified accounts for this context.
10. For the reasons above I conclude that this significant harm to the character and appearance of the building and its setting within the terrace results in conflict with policies LP1, LP2 and LP5 of the London Borough of Wandsworth Local Plan (2023). These policies, amongst other considerations, require that proposals enhance and relate positively to the prevailing local character and respect and/or complement the form, setting, period and detailing of the host building. In reaching this finding, I have also had regard to the London Borough of Wandsworth Housing SPD (2016) and its advice that contemporary design additions will need to ensure

that the whole building remains a harmonious and attractive composition and that they do not detract from the setting and appearance of their neighbours.

### **Other matters**

11. I note that the height and obscure glazing proposed for the balustrades will ensure no loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers with a neutral impact on their living conditions in respect of this specific consideration. I also acknowledge that there will be benefits afforded from the appeal proposal in comparison to the permitted development's absence of balconies. These include future occupiers of the dwellings at the appeal site being able to use and enjoy their own, private outdoor space. The proximity to trees and the orientation will secure specific benefits of connecting with nature and enjoying afternoon and evening sunlight throughout the year. However, I afford these benefits minor weight which falls considerably short of outweighing the harm to the character and appearance of the building and its setting within the terrace.
12. An objection from a third party at the application stage referenced elements of the proposal other than the proposed balconies and related to loss of light and heat. The rest of the proposal has since been granted planning permission by the Council, and I have no evidence before me to conclude any differently to them about the matters raised by the third party. My conclusions are the same with regards to the third party's comments in relation to the condition of a boundary wall.
13. There will be social and economic benefits derived from the creation of the additional dwelling, but I afford limited weight to these given that the subsequently approved development also includes the additional dwelling and is being implemented.

### **Conclusions**

14. The significant harm to the character and appearance of the building and its setting within the terrace is not outweighed by the benefits derived from the proposal. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed

*S Sharp*

INSPECTOR