



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2023

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/22/3305512

4 Norroy Road, London SW15 1PF

- 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 Jonathan Howell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/1919, dated 23 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2022
 - The proposal was described as 'remodelling of front facade and creation of additional storey'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was determined using amended plans and an amended description of development, described by the Council as 'Alterations to fenestrations, including alterations to windows'. I have used the amended drawings in coming to my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The property is located on Norroy Road close to the junction with Putney High Street. Norroy Road is a quiet predominantly residential street characterised mainly by long terraces of period properties with slight variations in style, facing materials and architectural detailing, but generally consistent in pattern and built form.
5. Numbers 2, 4 and 6 Norroy Road form a modern terrace of three properties, Number 4 has been altered in appearance, is white rendered and the ground floor bay window has been removed and replaced with a standard window. Whilst the terrace is modern and has been subject to various alterations, the dwelling relates well to its surroundings in scale, character and materials.
6. The proposed double storey square bay in glass brick would, due to its extent, dominate the façade of the host property and the properties either side of it. In addition, the proposed design would be out of keeping with the host property and adjoining properties. This would erode consistency with the adjoining

properties further. The elements of the proposal including the glass brick around the front door and the replacement window at second floor level would have a neutral effect, however the proposal in its entirety would be incongruous and harmful to the character of the area.

7. For these reasons I conclude that the remodelling of the front façade would have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore fail to accord with Policy IS 3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan – Core Strategy (Adopted March 2016) which seeks to ensure good quality design that protects and reinforces the existing varied character of the borough. The proposal would fail to accord with Policies DMS 1 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan – Development Management Policies Document (Adopted March 2016) which between them seek to ensure that the scale and appearance of a development contributes positively to local spatial character, and requires proposals to use appropriate materials and not to dominate or compete with the original building, and Policy D6 of The London Plan (March 2021) which requires housing development to be of a high quality design.
8. The proposal does not accord with the Framework having regard to chapters 2 and 12 which require developments to contribute to achieving sustainable development and achieving well-designed places.
9. Having regard to the Wandsworth Local Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Document Adopted November 2016 (SPD), it states that the key objective is to ensure highest possible standards in design, taking into account the setting of a building and the wider public realm. For the reasons mentioned, this proposal is contrary to the guidance contained within the SPD.

Other Matters

10. The report of the Council's Officer into this application referred to a recommendation for approval subject to conditions. However, the body of the report and decision notice indicate this is a typographical error. This does not affect the considerations that have led to my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the remodelling of the front façade would not accord with the policies IS 3, DMS 1, DMS 5 and D6. Although the proposal does not conflict with other policies, this leads me to conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR