



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025 by J Reed MPlan

**Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 20 August 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3361815**

**44 Hazlewell Road, Wandsworth, London SW15 6LR**

- 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 & Mrs Van Zwanenberg against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref is 2024/1763.
  - The development proposed is demolition of existing boundary wall and construction of new boundary wall, provision of vehicular access for creation of off-street parking.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposed development on highway safety; and
  - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Putney Conservation Area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

#### *Highway Safety*

4. Due to the constrained parameters of the indicated off-street parking area, it would be challenging to manoeuvre a vehicle within the site to enable it to exit the proposed access point in a forward gear. Whilst I note the appellant's suggestion that such a manoeuvre would be possible, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate this. I observed that traffic levels are consistent with the area's residential character. Even so, drivers reversing from the site onto Campion Road would be likely to have restricted visibility of other highway users, particularly those emerging from Hazlewell Road given the immediate proximity of the junction. This situation would unacceptably increase risk of conflict or collision with other road users including pedestrians.
5. The appellant has referred me to other corner plots served by dropped kerb access points. However, it is unclear from the limited information provided as to whether

those particular access arrangements were granted planning permission and if so what the material considerations were in those instances. In any case, they do not overcome my site-specific concerns relating to the appeal proposal.

6. For the above reasons, I find that there would be an unacceptable effect on highway safety. In that regard, it would conflict with Policies T4 and LP50 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) (WLP) which require that developments that require new or additional crossovers or vehicle access will need to demonstrate that they would not cause a road safety hazard.
7. The Council's decision also refers to the Local Plan SPD Housing (2016). However, I have not been referred to any specific paragraphs and from what I have seen the guidance relating to front gardens and hardstanding for cars primarily relates to whether planning permission will be required. In any case, this does not diminish the conflict with the above policies of the WLP.

### *Character and appearance*

8. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling situated at the corner of Hazlewell Road and Campion Road. The front of the site is currently bordered by a low boundary wall with fencing above. High close boarded fencing is located towards the rear of the site where it borders Campion Road.
9. The site is located within 'Character Area D: The Westbury Estate' as identified in The West Putney Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAA). The character of this area is predominantly Edwardian and positively contributes to the attractive residential enclave within this part of the West Putney Conservation Area (CA). The CAA confirms that whole streets here were developed by different builders, but under the auspices of J. C. Radford which has led to a particular continuity of style.
10. The CAA identifies the suburban character of the Westbury Estate area is reflected in the historic use of close boarded timber fences on low brick base walls to front boundary treatments. However, the CAA also recognises that where rear gardens border a street, the boundaries are usually high brick walls in stock brick with red brick buttresses, two-tone panels or other decorative effects to break up the potential monotony. It also notes that where car parking has been incorporated, all too often front gardens are bereft of greenery and planting, and the effect can be spare and alienating, especially in areas with clusters of sparse frontages and hard standings.
11. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires when determining proposals in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
12. The wall along the site frontage would be modest in height and punctuated by pillars, thereby maintaining consistency with the scale and character of other boundary treatments within the Conservation Area (CA). Although the wall would rise in height along the side boundary, this would be in keeping with many other corner properties in the CA, where rear gardens abut the street. Furthermore, the appellant has indicated that materials echoing those of the host dwelling could be incorporated and this could be secured by condition.

13. The hard-surfaced off street parking area would be screened by the boundary treatment to the Hazlewell frontage. Whilst it would be visible through the proposed vehicular access on Campion Road, it would not be seen to sit within a cluster of hard standings on that road. In any case it would not appear incongruous in the context of the numerous other hard surfaced parking areas in the CA and the hedgerow planting incorporated would suitably soften the interface of the site with these roads.
14. I conclude, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. In that particular regard, it would comply with the requirements of Policies LP1, LP2 and LP3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) which require high quality design which relates positively to the prevailing local character, that development is not visually intrusive and preserve the character, appearance and significance of any heritage asset.
15. The Council's decision also refers to the guidance set out in the Local Plan SPD Housing (2016). I have not been referred to any specific paragraphs and given that I have found the development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, this guidance does not alter my conclusion.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

16. I have found that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. However, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on highway safety. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Reed*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*M Russell*

INSPECTOR