

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

**by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 19 July 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/17/3174294**

**45 St Johns Avenue, London SW15 6AL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Andrew Blazye against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref 2016/7188, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2017.
  - The development proposed is demolition of the existing side garage and formation of a new one and a half storey side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing side garage and formation of a new one and a half storey side extension at 45 St Johns Avenue, London SW15 6AL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2016/7188, dated 13 December 2016 and 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 the following approved plans: L1; S1; S2; C1; C1 Revision A.
  - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the West Putney Conservation Area (CA).

## Reasons

3. The CA is characterised by large properties that vary in architecture and are set back from the highway with significant mature planting giving a spacious and verdant feel to the area. The host property is semi-detached, with a prominent forward facing gable and constructed in distinctive red and buff bricks with white render.
-

4. In terms of relationship to the host dwelling, the proposed extension would be set back from the main front elevation and despite its steep lean-to roof, would appear proportionate and subordinate in scale. The slope of the roof would be broadly consistent with that of the existing front gable and though extensive in area, when viewed from an oblique angle, would be visually absorbed by the greater mass of the side elevation to the main dwelling.
5. The extension would incorporate a relatively large triangular shaped window to the front elevation which would serve the mezzanine study. This feature would give the extension a contemporary feel however, as a glazed panel, would appear recessive and would allude to the triangular form of the adjacent gable. The structure would also incorporate architectural details that would match the existing dwelling including white timber fascia boards and arched courses of brickwork. I conclude that the structure would appear well integrated with the host property.
6. In terms of the wider CA, the steep sloping roof would serve to limit the bulk of the extension at the upper floor level. This in turn would ensure that the extensive gap between the sides of Nos 43 and 45 at higher level, which provides deep views to the rear of the property including attractive mature planting would remain substantially open. Although the Council's Conservation and Design officer has referred, in their consultation response, to existing approvals for extensions to the side of No 43, this was not mentioned as an influential factor in the planning officer's assessment and it is uncertain, from the information before me, whether that permission remains extant.
7. In any event, when considering the presence of the existing garage and that the bulk of the upper level of the proposed extension would be limited, I am not persuaded that the development would materially harm the sense of openness within the street scene. In addition to the retention of openness, the varied architecture along the street means that the contemporary design of the extension would not interrupt any strong sense of visual uniformity or cohesion.
8. Concern has been expressed that the extension would alter the balance between the property and the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 47. However it was apparent from my visit that the adjoining property has already received a substantial two storey side extension. When also considering the flat roof of the existing garage to the host property, the sense of visual balance between the two dwellings has already been significantly diluted and it seems to me that the limited scale of the proposal would not serve to further reinforce this impact.
9. It has been drawn to my attention that a previous proposal for a side extension to the host property was dismissed at appeal. I have been provided with limited information, however it would appear that the proposal in that case involved a significantly bulkier two storey extension which would not be comparable to current appeal.
10. In accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I have a statutory duty under section 72(1) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. I conclude for the above reasons that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and host building. I therefore find that it would accord with Policies DMS 2 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth

Development Management Policies Document 2016 insofar as they seek development to be well designed, to avoid dominating the original building and to conserve or enhance the surrounding historic environment.

**Conditions and Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons, and having taken into consideration all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
12. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

*Roy Merrett*

INSPECTOR