



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3375164

59 Elsynge Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 2HR

- 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 Piers Clanford against the decision of Wandsworth Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/2160.
 - The proposed development is described as works to existing single-family dwelling, to replace a single storey garage, and to create a side extension at lower ground floor, upper ground floor and first floor, providing improved accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area ('the WCCA').

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
4. Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') states that great weight shall be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, such as conservation areas, and that harm to their significance requires clear and convincing justification. Policy LP3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (2023) ('WLP') largely reflects that approach, and requires the conservation of features and elements that contribute to a heritage asset's significance and character, and the reinstatement of appropriate features that have been lost.
5. The Wandsworth Common Conservation Area Appraisal ('the CAA') sets out that the area's special character derives from the fine-grained pattern of development surrounding the common. It describes the buildings as mainly Victorian and Edwardian, and arranged in two to three storey terraces and semi-detached pairs. Within the Elsynge Road Sub-Area, the CAA references the two and three storey villas, many in paired and semi-detached compositions, with consistent elevational language and original boundary treatment. I observed that the buildings here are

well-proportioned, often arranged in small cohesive groups of a similar style, and with attractive architectural detailing typical of their era. These elements all contribute to the WCCA's significance.

6. The host is prominently positioned in the WCCA at the corner of Elsynge Road and Marcilly Road. Together with 57 Elsynge Road ('No 57') it forms a semi-detached pair, which is essentially two storeys high with a gabled form, but with small centrally positioned front and rear dormers serving accommodation within the roofspace, and lightwells to a lower ground floor. The pair displays regular fenestration, similar detailing, and matching facing materials, and each is accessed via an arched porch in a narrow, two storey side projection with side facing windows and a parapet roof.
7. Although the host also has an attached garage, given its very modest scale, its sympathetic London stock brick finish and its limited height, it is not a prominent feature, and it does not detract significantly from the building's symmetry and overall appearance. Rather than being perceived as an individual villa as claimed by the appellant, I observed that in the Elsynge Road streetscene and around its junction with Marcilly Road, No 59 is seen with No 57 as a well-balanced semi-detached pair, which is broadly similar to the pair at Nos 53 and 55 Elsynge Road. This cohesive group undoubtedly makes a positive contribution to the area.
8. The proposed side extension would be faced in high quality materials to match the host, it would be articulated, and it would be set down below the host's eaves line. However, its ground floor, which would extend to the edge of the pavement on Marcilly Road, would be much taller than the garage it would replace, and its first floor would be much wider across the front compared to the existing two storey side projection. Thus, whilst planning permission was previously granted for a lower ground and upper ground floor extension in this location¹, considered as a whole the scheme's form and bulk would markedly disrupt the balance and symmetry of the pair and the composition of this small cohesive group. Its two storey rectilinear form and bulk would give it a discordant relationship with the host, and it would appear awkward on this prominent corner plot.
9. Whilst the first floor extension's lower parapet compared to the existing two storey side projection would help reveal the arched window in the host's flank, it would add slightly to the loss of symmetry. As referenced in the Design and Access Statement by Patel Taylor, the scheme would include appropriate detailing such as false windows to provide articulation and to reflect similar features elsewhere in the WCCA, the removal of a downpipe, and the reinstatement or introduction of architectural elements, including decorative bargeboards and a finial, and brick boundary walls and railings, with planting. However, whilst beneficial, and finding a measure of support from WLP Policy LP3 and the CAA, those details would not mitigate the harm caused as a result of the scheme's inappropriate form and bulk.
10. I therefore conclude that the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the streetscene, and that it would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the WCCA. It would thereby conflict with WLP Policy LP3, and with the requirement in WLP Policies LP1 and LP5 to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of development

¹ Ref: 2023/1709

relates positively to the prevailing local character, and that extensions respect the host building.

11. Whilst the proposed extension would include appropriate set-backs, it would also conflict with the advice in the Wandsworth Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) that alterations and extensions should respect the form and proportions of the original house and should be complementary to the surroundings; and the advice in the Wandsworth Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document (2016) that development should conserve and enhance the significance of the historic environment.
12. Having regard to the statutory duty, the scheme would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the WCCA. In accordance with the Framework, the harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset is a matter to which I attribute great weight. However, in the language of the Framework, and having regard to the scale of the proposal in the context of the WCCA as a whole, as the harm caused would be less than substantial, I will weigh it against the public benefits.

Other considerations

13. Notwithstanding the need for housing in Wandsworth, the scheme would not contribute to housing supply; and given my findings regarding the extension's design and its impact on the streetscene, it does not find support from Framework paragraph 125 e).
14. In its favour, the scheme would make a small contribution to the economy during construction and, having regard to Framework paragraph 125 c), whilst it would not deliver a home, it would use brownfield land within a settlement. It would also improve living conditions within the host property, including an additional bedroom and spaces for home-working. In regard to these modest public benefits, it finds a measure of support from the Framework and the development plan.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

15. The Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. I have found that the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area and, having regard to the statutory duty, that it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the WCCA. Notwithstanding its limited benefits, it would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole.
16. In accordance with the Framework, I have given great weight to the conservation of this designated heritage asset. Whilst I have identified modest public benefits as a result of the proposal, having regard to its paragraph 215, they would not outweigh the harm that would be caused.
17. The scheme would conflict with the development plan, and material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper INSPECTOR