



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3332518
65 Lessingham Avenue, London SW17 8LZ

- 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 David Hanlon against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2023/2394, dated 22 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extension and associated alterations including removal of the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the host property and the character and appearance of the area, including the Totterdown Fields Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. 65 Lessingham Avenue is an end of terrace property with a detached garage to the side. It is a spacious plot compared to the rest of the tightly knit estate formed of a grid layout of terraced streets. The gaps between the properties at the various junctions are an integral part of the layout with the space providing an important physical and visual break in the continuous built form.
4. The property is part of the Totterdown Fields Conservation Area and in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, special attention it to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The *Totterdown Fields Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (Conservation Area Appraisal)* explains that the area was built as a cottage estate and is a very fine example of properties influenced by the Garden City and Arts & Crafts movement, with the similar patterns of detail and materials contributing to its character.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension is of a smaller scale and different design to that which was previously refused and dismissed on appeal (Appeal ref: APP/H5960/A/02/1103118). It would be a subservient addition, set back from the front elevation and down from the ridge line with materials to match. As such, the design reflects the basic rules for such extensions set out in the

Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (paragraph 4.20). The projection has a limited width and whilst the single-storey wrap-around element extends further, a large visual gap would be retained to the side of the property.

6. Notwithstanding that, the properties addressing the gaps at the junction of Lessingham Avenue and Blakenham Road also have a consistency in design details. In contrast to the rest of the terrace, the corner properties have their entrance to the flank elevation with a notable arrangement of fenestration to the first floor. That form is also replicated at the other end of the terrace row.
7. By covering a large part of the flank elevation and relocating the entrance that unity would be diminished and the focus of the flank, as a main elevation facing the gap, would be lost. Additionally, while the two ends are not seen together, it would unbalance the composition of the terrace. An aspect highlighted in the Conservation Area Appraisal which advises *that proposed extensions to houses at the end of terraces must respect the symmetry and uniformity of the overall terrace to warrant planning permission*, and explains that problems have occurred through small-scale changes, including changes to windows and doors, disrupting the cohesive appearance of groups of properties.
8. The appellant has referred me to examples of extensions to other properties nearby, and I accept that alterations and additions to end properties are not precluded. Nevertheless, I do not find these other extensions to be directly comparable. 71 Lessingham Avenue is a rear extension, and the side extensions to 34 and 74 Coteford Street echo the design of the host property, (which is different to the appeal property), and No.74 is not located at a corner.
9. Overall, whilst the visual separation of the gap would be retained, the proposal fails to respond to the design of the property, individually, and as part of the wider terrace, the street scene and the homogeneity of the estate. To that end, there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area and the proposal would fail to preserve the significance of the Totterdown Fields Conservation Area.
10. The harm to the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. I acknowledge that the garage is not a positive feature, and that the proposal also includes the replacement of the modern-style windows. However, these are modest elements, and the extension would be for the private benefit of the occupiers. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the conservation of heritage assets should be given great weight (paragraph 205), and the public benefits would not outweigh the identified harm.
11. Thus, the proposal would conflict with policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038, the Housing SPD, the Conservation Area Appraisal and the NPPF. Together these promote high-quality design that integrates with their surroundings and wider place-making, is sympathetic to the style of the building, and to preserve or enhance heritage assets.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR