



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2019

by A Thompson BSc BTP MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/19/3226528

39 Becmead Avenue, London, SW16 1UJ

- 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 Liaqat Hanif against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 18/05034/FUL, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is retention of single storey ground floor rear extension to provide conservatory. Glazed screen to side passage. New rear boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development used by the appellant in their appeal form in the banner heading above, as this more accurately describes the development, than the description in the application form. The appeal is partly retrospective as the development appears to have been substantially completed, apart from the new rear boundary fence.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of 39 Becmead Avenue (the host building) and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host building is a substantial semi-detached property located on the north side of Becmead Avenue. The rear extension has been largely completed and appears wholly discordant with the host building. It is out of scale in terms of its width and depth with the original outrigger and outshot. Its substantial mono pitch roof is at odds with the hipped roofs on the original building and has an awkward interface with an existing side extension at roof level.
5. The poor quality of the materials used, particularly on the roof, and the use of full height glazing on all new elevations, which the Council accurately describes as "closer in appearance to a low-quality shop front construction" further detracts from the character and appearance of the building.
6. Although many of the adjacent buildings appear to have been extended at the rear, those extensions generally appear more sympathetic to their host building

- in terms of their scale, design and use of materials. In contrast, and despite the extensive use of glazing, the rear extension is a dominant feature on the rear elevation of the property and its incongruous scale and design and its poor materials are harmful to the character and appearance of both the host building and the surrounding area to the rear.
7. To the rear of the property is the Wigmore Lawn Tennis Club (the Club). I understand it is a private membership club, however, given its scale and level of use (which was evident from the large number of visitors I saw on the day of my site visit), the Club can be regarded as akin to public domain. The rear extension, which is on higher ground, is visible from the Club grounds.
 8. My attention has been drawn to a recent permission to construct a new outbuilding for the Club, which will be located immediately adjacent to the boundary with the rear gardens of Nos. 37 and 39 Becmead Avenue. This building appears to be under construction. The outbuilding will extend almost the full width of the rear garden of No.39, however, because it is single storey with a low pitched roof and built on a level below the lower garden level of No.39, the rear extension of the host building would, in my view, remain visible from the grounds of the tennis club.
 9. Furthermore, the principal pedestrian access point to the Club grounds is via a passageway adjacent to No.41 Becmead Avenue. The side and rear elevation of the rear extension is in relatively close proximity to, and clearly visible from that well used pedestrian access point. Although there is a proposal to provide additional boundary fencing, at the same height as the existing boundary wall, this would not entirely prevent the rear extension being visible from that footpath. As a consequence the harmful impact of the rear extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area would continue to be evident to those using the footpath to return to Becmead Avenue from the club.
 10. The provision of a fully glazed screen with white aluminium frame and door in the side passageway is distinctly at odds with both the front elevation of the host property and the wider street scene in terms of its scale, materials and design. The screen does not reflect local architecture, or characteristic boundary treatments used in the surrounding area. As a result, the screen detracts from the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene on Becmead Avenue.
 11. I have little substantive information about the proposed rear boundary fence. In any event, as any consideration on this matter would not fundamentally affect my findings on the main issue, and as the appeal would in any case, be dismissed, it is not necessary for me to give further consideration to this matter.
 12. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would not accord with policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and the design guidance in the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015), in so far as these policies and guidance seek to encourage well designed extensions that respect the character of the host building and reinforce local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

Anthony Thompson

INSPECTOR