



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3369560

Flat C, 97 Alfriston Road, London SW11 6NP

- 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 Sam Griffiths against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0518.
 - The development proposed is the “construction of a rear mansard roof extension with dormer and conversion of existing roof from a hip to a gable”.
-

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 4 December 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has not raised any objections to the development in terms of its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, highway safety or fire safety. Based on the evidence before me, and my observations at the site visit, I have no reason to take a different view. I therefore consider the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is positioned at the end of a short three-storey terrace fronting Alfriston Road in a residential area of Victorian and Edwardian properties, many of which have been subject to roof alterations and extensions. The property is divided into four self-contained flats (Flats A-D) with the appeal proposal relating to Flat C, which is located on the second and third floors of the property.
4. During my site visit I noticed that the terrace has a grander presence than the mainly two storey residential properties that surround it, in part due to its street facing frontage, architectural shopfront detailing on the ground floor, its additional storey and its distinctive symmetrical hipped roof. As such the terrace makes a significant, positive contribution to the local townscape, particularly in the context of the numerous roof alterations and extensions to properties in the area.
5. 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.

6. 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 retained¹.
7. Contrary to the guidance in the SPD, the proposal would introduce a gabled roof to one end of the terrace, thus unbalancing the visual symmetry of the terrace. Whilst I accept that it is not possible to view both ends of the terrace at the same time, given the shortness of the terrace, the symmetry of the roof form is readily appreciated to passers-by, therefore it is not essential to view the terrace as a whole, in order to appreciate its balanced form.
8. With regards to the proposed mansard roof to the rear of the property, its scale, mass and form, in combination with the end of the terrace's gable extension, would result in a dominant and discordant feature which would be visible in views from Alfriston Road. This would further disrupt the established architectural form of the appeal property, damaging its significant, positive contribution to the local townscape.
9. I acknowledge that the rear mansard roof would be set back from the side of the building and would have a 70 degree slope and the development would be constructed of materials to match the rest of the property. I also note that the gable end would be clad in tiles to tie in with the property's roof. However, given my findings above, these measures would not make the development acceptable.
10. Whilst the appellant has drawn my attention to several other properties in the surrounding area that have already been extended in a similar manner to that proposed (including properties which have been subject to hip to gable extensions) I am not aware of the full circumstances of these other cases. In any case, I find that these altered properties have only served to heighten the appeal property's value as an original, intact roof in the street scene, therefore they do not justify its modification.
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. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. I accept that the development would create additional space within the flat, transforming it from a 2-bed flat to a 3-bed family-sized flat which would optimise the density of the appeal site. I also note that the proposal has local support from some neighbours. However, these matters are neutral factors and as such, while they do not weigh in the balance against the proposal, nor do they weigh in its favour.
13. The appellant suggests, were this appeal to succeed, there would be increased likelihood that an equivalent hip to gable extension would be built at the other end of the terrace (101 Alfriston Road) which would restore balance to the terrace, therefore the unbalance would be temporary. However, there is no compelling

¹ Paragraph 4.133 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Housing Adopted November 2016

evidence before me to indicate that this would occur, nor a mechanism to secure such development. As such I have given this matter little weight in the determination of the appeal.

14. I have also considered the appellant's point that were the appeal property to be a single dwelling house, the proposed hip to gable end extension would constitute 'permitted development' under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (GPDO). However, since the property is subdivided into flats and the extension would not comply with the provisions of the GPDO it is not a realistic alternative so carries no weight in the determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

SE Hughes

INSPECTOR