
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **SE Hughes BA (Hons) PGDip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3367356

50 Maskelyne Close, Wandsworth, London SW11 4AE

- 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 Teodora Danilovic against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/3571.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A rear extension was already in situ at the time of my site visit. It was the subject of a failed enforcement appeal in July 2024¹. This appeal seeks a revised design for the ground floor rear extension. Since the development on the ground is not the same as that shown on the plans, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that permission is being sought for the proposed development shown on the plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located on the ground and first floor of a 4-storey block of maisonettes within the Ethelburga Estate. Constructed in the 1960s, the estate has a simple, uniform appearance comprising of long, low-rise blocks of maisonettes and a single tower block, set amongst large open spaces. These distinctive qualities contribute positively to the area's sense of place and its individual local character.
5. Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (WLP) require developments to be of high design quality, to relate positively to the prevailing local character, and, in the case of residential extensions, to be subservient to the host building and sympathetic in style.
6. In terms of its overall size and scale, the proposed extension would be subordinate to the block. However, even with its staggered set back, it would still project significantly beyond the rear of the building, therefore, would appear as an

¹ Appeal reference APP/H5960/C/23/3329230

incongruous addition, which disrupts and dominates the rear façade of the appeal property itself. In this regard it would erode the original simplicity of the host building and the estate's cohesiveness.

7. My attention has been drawn to Flats 11, 12 and 51 Maskelyne Close, which have already been extended in a similar manner to that proposed and to several outbuildings located within the internal square to the rear of the appeal property, including 4 adjacent 'lock ups'.
8. Whilst I accept the extensions to Flats 11, 12 and 51 have somewhat adjusted the original appearance of the estate, I agree with the Inspector for the previous enforcement appeal, that they are interpreted as 'odd additions', whereby I find that the estate has largely maintained its original character. As such, these extensions do not set a precedent that provides a justification for the appeal proposal. With regards to the lock ups and various outbuildings, as they are physically detached from the building, they do not detract from its original form.
9. The appellant has explained that the extension would replace the property's pre-existing extension. Although I do not know the precise history of this extension, I can see from the pre-existing plans before me it was much smaller in scale and did not occupy the whole width of the ground floor of the appeal property. As such it would have had less impact than the appeal scheme. Therefore, in the light of the design incongruity I have found above, its pre-existence does not justify the larger appeal scheme.
10. The proposed extension would introduce contemporary Larch timber panelling and dark grey framed openings, which would neither blend with nor complement the host building, which features prefabricated panelling and white framing between vertical red brick piers. I have considered the appellant's suggestion that a condition could be imposed to require that the materials match the rest of the property. However, whilst this would help to unify the proposed extension with the building, given my findings above, this would not make the development acceptable.
11. I appreciate that most of the garden will remain free of structures and available for amenity use by the occupants of the appeal property and that the development would not be detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. I also note that the proposal has local support from some neighbours. Furthermore, that there would be some very modest economic benefits associated with its construction and social benefits in respect of improved living space for the inhabitants of the appeal property. Were a green roof to be provided, as suggested by the appellant, this would also provide a very modest environmental benefit. However, all these matters are neutral factors and as such, while they do not weigh in the balance against the proposal, nor do they weigh in its favour.
12. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with policies LP1 and LP5 of the WLP. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the

development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

SE Hughes

INSPECTOR