



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by **M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3370646

28 Montserrat Road, Wandsworth, London SW15 2LA

- 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 London Richmond Construction Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1397.
 - The development proposed is Conversion of a house into 2 self-contained flats with independent entrances; Excavation of new basement with front and rear lightwells and associated windows and doors; Ground floor infills to create enlarged kitchen with associated doors, windows and rooflights; Extension of outrigger towards Burstock Road at first and second floor levels; Alterations to fenestration on the gable and flank wall of outrigger along Burstock Road elevation; French doors and balconettes to the first and second floor bedrooms in the rear façade; Dormer extension (set back from edge of Burstock Road gable) to existing rear roof slope and the creation of a roof terrace with frosted glass balustrade at Third Floor level serving as amenity space to the upper floor maisonette; Introduction of an additional Velux rooflight in the front roof slope; New flat rooflights in the flat roof of the rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the area including the Oxford Road Conservation Area ('Oxford Road CA'); and,
 - ii) the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, places a duty to require special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the special character or appearance of a conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') requires me to assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal.
4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey with basement and accommodation at roof level, end of terrace dwelling. This property forms part of a terrace of properties, which is located within the Oxford Road CA.
5. Based on my observations, the special character of the Oxford Road CA is derived principally from the variety of high quality detached, semi-detached and terraced Victorian houses. In particular, Montserrat Road is characterised by mainly two

and three storey buildings of two types. The two storey buildings have projecting square bay windows with gabled roof. They are red brick with rendering to bays and decorative scrollwork to panels below first floor windows. Some properties have attic windows to gabled roof crowned with decorative triangular pediments. Upper portions of sash windows are subdivided into a number of smaller lights.

6. Based on the above and my observations, the significance of the Oxford Road CA lies with its history, the arrangement of its buildings and the quality of their similar forms and architecture. Together, the appeal property and similar nearby properties, contribute positively to the generally cohesive street scene, roofscapes and the traditional character and appearance of the Oxford Road CA.
7. Because the appeal property is an end terrace it is particularly prominent and sensitive to change. In particular, in views from along Burstock Road.
8. While the modest increase in the outrigger's width may be acceptable in isolation, particularly as the roof pitch would remain unchanged, the cumulative effect of this enlargement together with the proposed French doors and balustrades would be harmful. Introducing this form of fenestration to the rear elevation would be wholly out of keeping with the host property, the wider terrace, and the established street scene. The French doors, in particular, would be prominently visible from Burstock Road and would appear incongruous alongside neighbouring dwellings, all of which retain traditional sash-window openings. Although the outrigger currently has no rear openings, any new fenestration should reflect the established pattern of the terrace rather than depart from it.
9. The proposed French doors and balustrades, by virtue of their scale and contemporary design, would constitute a stark and visually intrusive intervention. They would disrupt the uniformity of the terrace and cause clear harm to the appearance of both the building and the wider group.
10. In addition, alterations are proposed to the main roof of the appeal property and the outrigger. While it is acknowledged that other dormers extend across the rear roof slopes of neighbouring properties within the wider terrace, the circumstances here differ materially. The proposed dormer would incorporate a roof terrace extending over part of the outrigger, and the associated screening for this in the form of opaque glazing would introduce additional bulk at roof level, making it highly visible in views from Burstock Road. Although the existing chimney stack would be retained and the dormer itself would be tile-clad with a sash window, these traditional elements would not mitigate the visual impact of the terrace structure. The use of opaque glazing as part of the enclosure would introduce a contrasting modern material in a prominent location, resulting in an incongruous and visually intrusive addition to the appeal property.
11. For the above reasons, cumulatively, the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and harms the character and appearance of the London Road CA. Having regard to the Framework, I assess the level of harm to be less than substantial.
12. The Framework advises that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. The proposed replacement of the mismatched existing windows with a consistent arrangement of traditional timber sash windows represents a clear design

enhancement that would improve the appearance of the property. The scheme would also make more efficient use of an existing building in an accessible location by providing an additional unit of accommodation. However, there is no substantive evidence to suggest that these improvements could not be delivered through alternative, less harmful alterations to the appeal property. While these matters align with the objectives of both local and national planning policy and are capable of being regarded as public benefits, the scale of the development (extensions to a single dwelling and the creation of one additional residential unit) means that the weight attributable to these benefits is modest.

14. Consequently, the public benefits that would arise from the proposal do not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset, to which the Framework states great weight should be afforded.
15. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with Policies LP1, LP2, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 ('LP') and Policy HC1 of the London Plan. Together and amongst other matters, these policies require proposals to sustain, preserve and wherever possible, enhance the significance of any heritage asset. Accordingly, the proposal is also contrary to the aims of the Framework for conserving and enhancing heritage assets.

Living conditions

16. The proposal would introduce new openings to the rear elevation of the new outrigger, whereas uncharacteristically the existing outrigger does not feature these. As such, the proposal would introduce a level of overlooking that does not currently exist.
17. In particular, at first floor level, the proposed new openings would allow some overlooking of the gardens of neighbouring properties. However, the proposed openings would face rear gardens rather than primary living spaces, and would do so from an elevation and angle that is typical within this terrace. The established pattern of development, combined with the generous separation created by neighbouring single-storey rear extensions, ensures that the potential for any meaningful loss of privacy is minimal.
18. Moreover, this general pattern of development is not uncharacteristic of the area. In a built-up context such as this, a degree of mutual overlooking is commonplace and generally accepted.
19. As already mentioned, the proposed openings would be in the form of French doors with safety railings, although these would be larger than the traditional sash windows in the wider terrace, I am unpersuaded that this in itself would result in a greater degree of overlooking into neighbouring properties, leading to an increased sense of loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy LP2 of the LP, which along with other things says development proposals must not adversely impact the amenity of existing and future occupiers or that of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

20. In addition to the above alterations, the proposal includes the excavation of a new basement with front and rear lightwells and associated windows and doors; Ground floor infills to create enlarged kitchen with associated doors, windows and

rooflights. I note that the Council found these elements of the proposal to be largely acceptable. I have also considered these and have no reason to disagree.

21. The first and second floor flat incorporates about 7.5sq.m of private amenity space, which is below the 15sq.m required for residential units with three or more bedrooms. However, as I am dismissing this appeal for other reasons it is not necessary for me to consider this further.

Planning balance and conclusion

22. I have found that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbours. However, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area including the Oxford Road CA. For this reason and conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR