



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2026

by **M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3362398

Studio 66, 67A Medfield Street, Wandsworth, London SW15 4JY

- 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 Glen Tomlin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/3334.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at Studio 66, 67A Medfield Street, Wandsworth, London SW15 4JY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/3334, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 103_P_001_P1, 103_P_201_P1, 103_P_203_P1, 103_P_211_P1, 103_P_212_P1, 103_P_213_P1, 103_P_214_P1, 103_P_301_P1, 103_P_303_P1, 103_P_311_P1, 103_P_312_P1, 103_P_313_P1, 103_P_314_P1.
 - 3) All external materials used in the construction of the walls of the development hereby approved shall match the type, texture, tone, colour, size and profile of those used on the existing building and shall be retained permanently.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the living conditions of future occupiers of the site with regard to light and outlook, and on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The site contains a small building, on a site to the rear of larger-scale dwellings fronting Medfield Road. It is accessed through some high gates that largely obscure views of the site, via a narrow driveway between Nos 65 and 67. There is a small garden to the side of the building, behind No 69.
4. The site has a history of other uses, having once been a builder's yard, and then an artist's studio. The Council has never envisaged the site as suitable for a dwelling, permission for residential use having been refused in the past.

Nevertheless, the current live-work use grew from the studio use and a lawful development certificate has been issued in connection with that. Whatever the current situation, the proposal does not include a change of use to a fully residential one, and 'work' space would remain, even if a greater amount of 'live' orientated space would result.

5. The existing accommodation is small, confined to an open plan, multifunctional use, with a mezzanine sleeping area. The proposal would extend from the existing front doors, filling in a substantial amount of the driveway between Nos 65 and 67. The significant increase in floorspace would result in much of the plot being developed, but the private garden to the side would be unaffected and still available for use, along with a small front garden between the new front door and gates into the site.
6. The unit is lit by rooflights on the rear roof slope and wide glazed doors to the front. There would be a significant reduction in the glazing to the front that serves the main living/studio space. However, unlike a scheme considered in a previous appeal, when it was found that adequate living conditions would not have been provided, around half the glazed width would be retained. Additional glazing would also be installed at the, currently solid, door into the garden.
7. While the effect of surrounding structures has not been explicitly modelled, a sunlight and daylight assessment indicates that adequate daylight would be provided to the internal spaces, with sufficient sunlight penetration to the main living/studio space. Guidelines do not require sunlight to all habitable rooms. Sunlight and daylight provision would, therefore, be acceptable.
8. The majority of the building would be lit by rooflights, with existing outlook to the front essentially lost: The retained views into a small triangular courtyard from the proposed studio/office and main living space would be very short range. That said, while the proximity of the boundaries and nearby properties could make this feel somewhat hemmed in, the existing outlook was always channelled along the driveway between the high walls of the neighbouring houses. With the addition of a new glazed door into the private side garden, and the ability to look out of the new kitchen area through the full height glazed entrance door, the overall effect on outlook would be acceptable.
9. I, therefore, find that the scheme before me would provide adequate living conditions for future residents. There would be no conflict with those aims of policy LP2 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023 ("LP") that requires development to preserve the amenity of existing occupiers.

Character and appearance

10. The site is within the Roehampton Village Conservation Area ("CA"). Given the siting, scale and lack of visibility of the development, the Council's conservation officer has confirmed that there would be no harm to the character and appearance, or significance of the CA. The previous Inspector found the same and, although the appeal building is of different design, materials and siting to the prevailing historic properties, I have no reason to depart from those conclusions. While very close or attached to the adjoining dwellings, the considerably smaller scale would not result in a terracing appearance within the street.

11. As before, the current scheme would not have an appreciable effect on the openness of the rear garden environment as seen from the public realm. The site itself would still be less open than now, and the building would be visibly larger when seen from the rear windows of neighbouring dwellings. In considering the previous proposal, the Inspector found that the extension would not respect the form of the existing building and would dominate its front. It was also found to result in a reduction in the general open setting of the immediate environment.
12. Any loss of openness about the surrounding dwellings would be most appreciated from No 67. The now-proposed triangular courtyard would provide more space alongside the adjoining garden environment at No 67, with less building aligned with its rear windows. Upper floor rear windows at No 65 are set away from the site boundary. The majority of the built form would be well below any neighbouring side windows from where views of the majority of the building might be obtainable.
13. In a further change, the extension would now be at the height of the eaves of the main building. While the front section would be higher, the proposal is accepted by the Council's conservation officer as being subservient to it. The plan form would still be in complete variance to the existing, broadly square building, but it would make effective use of, and respond to, the unusually shaped site. Although the building's existing front face would not be visible, such that the extension, rather than original building would be the dominant built form seen by visitors on arrival at the site, this would not be harmful, given that neither the existing building nor its siting are characteristic of the area now.
14. For these reasons, although the changes to the proposal may be relatively minor, when considered in relation to the limited, mainly private, places from which the development could be appreciated they are sufficient to provide adequate space about the building and respect for its design and setting.
15. Although the front extension could not be deemed minor addition in the context of the existing building, I, therefore, find that there would be no conflict with the overall aims of LP policies LP1 and LP5 that require development to integrate well with their surroundings, relating positively to prevailing local character, and the form of the host building, with front extensions not being intrusive in the street scene.

Other Matters

16. Through the previous appeal, it was established that the effect of a building of broadly these proportions would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. While it would be visible, it would be low so have a minimal effect on light. There would be windows facing No 67 that were not in the previous scheme, but relative to the existing situation there would be no harm to privacy. I, therefore, have no reason to disagree with the previous conclusions.
17. Additional floorspace could result in an increase in the number of people using or residing at the site, but as most of the extension would be sited between the flank walls of the neighbouring houses, that would not have a tangible effect on the living conditions of those residents through noise or other disturbance.
18. If access to services, ducts or flues of neighbouring properties need to be maintained, or there is a risk of damage during construction, these are private matters to be resolved by the parties outside the appeal process. I acknowledge

ongoing disputes about boundaries between the parties, but that has little bearing on the current proposal, which would be positioned within the confines of the site.

19. The planning system is the first line of defence in ensuring fire safety. The kitchen, which may be the most likely place for a fire to start, would be between the main living accommodation and only exit from the site to the street. Nevertheless, the Council has confirmed that this matter can be adequately addressed through the Building Regulations.

Conditions

20. Alongside the standard time limit condition, a condition is required specifying the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host building, a condition is required to ensure that external materials match those of the existing building. I have amended the Council's suggested condition so that it only relates to the walls, as roofs are intended to differ.
21. The Council has suggested a further condition requiring rooflights to be of a conservation style and flush fitting with the roof pitch in which they would be located. However, the new rooflights would be large glazed areas, located within flat roofs, and are of an appropriate design for the architectural style proposed. I have not, therefore, imposed such a condition.

Conclusion

22. I have found no conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations have been identified that indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
23. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR