



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3374111

Flat 7, 12-13 Louvaine Road, Wandsworth, London SW11 2AQ

- 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 Ms Veday Demir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2025/2513.
 - The development proposed is rear mansard to facilitate a loft conversion and roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St Johns Hill Grove Conservation Area ('the Conservation Area') and,
 - ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property lies within a Conservation Area. In exercising my duties as the decision maker, I am required under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) further requires an assessment of the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal, so that the impact of the development on that significance can be properly understood and taken into account.
4. The residential parts of the Conservation Area derive their heritage significance from the high quality Victorian villas and terraces, many of which feature decorative stucco window surrounds, bay windows and raised entrances.
5. Properties 12 and 13 Louvaine Road comprise a pair of four storey semi detached Victorian villas that have been connected and converted into flats. The appeal property occupies the top floor of what was originally No. 12, together with part of the historic infill between the two buildings. Its position opposite the junction with Oberstein Road allows for long range views of the property along that street.
6. The appeal property forms part of a group of imposing paired villas that make a significant contribution to the street scene. While the two end properties include

mansard additions, the majority of the group retains its original roof form. Despite the presence of the infill extension, which is recessed when viewed from the highway, properties 12 and 13 Louvaine Road continue to display the characteristics that define this highly consistent Victorian townscape. This consistency is evident in the principal elevations and at roof level, where strong parapets with corncicing create a unified roofline in views along the street. As a result, the appeal property and the wider group of which it forms a part of, make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its significance.

7. The proposed roof extension would remove the existing butterfly roof and alter the established roof profile. However, despite its vertical front elevation, the extension would sit well back from the principal façade and incorporates a lowered internal floor level. In combination with the existing parapet, this recessing limits its visibility from street level. Although the appellant's Computer Generated Images do not clearly depict the extension above the link, the angle of view drawings and my own observations indicate that the new roof form would read only as a modest projection of the existing roofline, with no appreciable massing above the parapet. Consequently, it is perceived only in more distant views and would not unduly disrupt the established roofline or the symmetry of the former pair of villas.
8. The Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document ('Housing SPD') advises that rear roof extensions to Victorian properties should normally adopt a mansard style form with a steeply sloping rear face, and that vertical rear elevations should be avoided because they can appear intrusive and overbearing. In this case, the rear elevation of the extension is set back from the modern rear façade. Although the rear wall is vertical and the rear slope incorporates three dormers, two of which extend the full height of the rear elevation, the degree of recessing reduces their perceived bulk and prevents the extension from appearing unduly dominant in the context of the sizeable and altered rear elevation.
9. The proposal includes a sizeable front terrace capable of accommodating seating, parasols and other domestic items that would sit above or close to the parapet. Such features would introduce visual clutter into the roofscape and increase the development's visibility from the public realm, and no enforceable mechanism has been put forward to regulate their use or placement. Although the roof extension itself has a limited impact, the scale and elevated position of the terrace create the potential for a level of activity that exceeds that typically associated with small domestic balconies.
10. In a Conservation Area where roofscapes are generally quiet, recessive and make only a limited contribution to activity levels, this increased activity, together with the associated noise, movement and visual presence at roof level, would be at odds with the established character. Taken together, these effects would erode the area's generally tranquil and domestic qualities, resulting in a degree of change that amounts to less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its significance.
11. In accordance with the Framework, the identified heritage harm, although less than substantial, must be given great weight in the decision making process. This harm is to be balanced against the scheme's public benefits, which primarily relate to improving the quality of accommodation for the appellants and making more effective use of the existing housing stock. These benefits attract some weight, but

they are limited in scale and do not outweigh the great weight that the Framework requires to be afforded to the conservation of heritage assets.

12. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would avoid harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, I find conflict with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (LP), which require development to achieve a high standard of design, respond positively to local character and preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets. London Plan Policy HC1 similarly seeks to ensure that proposals affecting heritage assets conserve their significance and contribute positively to local distinctiveness.

Living Conditions

13. The proposed front roof terrace would measure approximately 21.7 sqm and be enclosed by the existing parapet, which is about 1.3m high. The rear terrace would be around 11.9 sqm and enclosed by a 1.2m balustrade.
14. From the rear terrace, there would be some potential for overlooking. Even so, the appeal property is within a building that already contains rear facing windows, and neighbouring occupiers are accustomed to a degree of mutual overlooking typical of this dense urban context. The proposed rear terrace would not introduce a materially different or more harmful pattern of overlooking than already exists, and any additional views would be limited and comparable to those available from existing upper-floor windows.
15. Nonetheless, the terraces together occupy a substantial proportion of the roof. Although the appellant refers to other roof level terraces in the area, these are generally differently configured and are not comparable in scale. The Housing SPD advises that terraces should be modest in size and designed to avoid creating spaces capable of hosting large or potentially noisy gatherings. By contrast, the size and elevated position of the proposed terraces create the capacity for more intensive activity, including outdoor seating and socialising, with a corresponding potential for increased noise. Given their extent and height, this risks causing undue disturbance to neighbouring occupiers, contrary to LP Policy LP2, which seeks to prevent unacceptable noise, disturbance and loss of amenity.

Other Matters

16. The submitted scheme has been amended in response to a previously refused proposal, which was dismissed on appeal. However, for the reasons set out above, this scheme falls short of being acceptable. The appellant has also expressed a willingness to make further amendments, but I must determine the appeal on the basis of the plans and details formally submitted.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR