
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3360192

Crestway, 246 Dover House Road, Wandsworth, London SW15 5DA

- 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 Karina Arden Macabee against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2024/3332.
 - The development is described as "erection of ground floor level front door canopy comprising 2 slim columns and a roof (No walls at all)".
-

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.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. The former also notes that the development has been completed. I am satisfied that the description on the application form accurately describes the proposal and is therefore reflected above. Moreover, and on this basis, the appeal seeks retrospective planning permission.
4. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published after the Council made their decision. I am satisfied that the changes do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their arguments thereon. The main issue for which is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Westmead Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a detached property fronting the highway in which the open sided door canopy is visible and attached to the existing porch. The building is set within a row of four dwellings adjacent the Roehampton Playing Fields. There is a level of uniformity of the buildings with two basic styles which are relatively unchanged which results in a well-preserved street scene. The defining features of the area are the large dwellings of varied architectural merit, mature trees and set back nature. The traditional design and consistency of the buildings contribute positively to the significance of the CA.

6. Whilst the porch maintains its centralised position on the dwelling and the basic levels of symmetry, the overall scale, form and forward siting of it results in an incongruous and overly prominent, more modern feature. Even though it is open sided and allows views through to the characterful dwelling it is emphasised and consequently detracts from the original pleasant, planned nature of the dwelling and how it assimilates with the cohesive qualities of the street scene. Moreover, it does not harmonise with the surrounding dwellings and their relatively unaltered and consistent front elevations, adversely affecting the significance of the CA.
7. It is not clear if the appellant's examples are located within the CA. Moreover, I am unaware of their planning status in whether they required or sought express planning permission. Nevertheless, these are the exception rather than the norm and not a reason to allow the same on this building for the reasons I have set out.
8. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing. Nationally speaking, paragraph 212 of the Framework places emphasis on great weight being given to an asset's conservation. Given the above assessment, the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Due to the scale of the development in context, the harm would be less than substantial. As directed by paragraph 215 of the Framework, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The Council have implied that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm, and the appellant has not provided any additional evidence to convince me otherwise. Resultantly, they can carry only very limited weight. As a result, they would not outweigh the great weight given to the harm to the CA. Therefore, there would be conflict with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023 and the Framework. Together, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and conserve the historic environment, amongst other things.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR