



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3374983

188 Dover House Road, Wandsworth, London SW15 5AR

- 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 Mrs Florence Osinloye against the decision of Wandsworth Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/2496.
 - The development is described as 'a new window replacement at the front elevation'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3374988

188 Dover House Road, Wandsworth, London SW15 5AR

- 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 Mrs Florence Osinloye against the decision of Wandsworth Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/2495.
 - The development is described as 'retention of front existing dormer (new metal cladding with insulation and window replacement) and replacement of roof tiles (retrospective)'.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3374983

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a window replacement at ground floor on the front elevation at 188 Dover House Road, Wandsworth, London SW15 5AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/2496, and drawing nos. P_05-Rev C and P_06 Rev C.

Appeal B Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3374988

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Procedural Matter

3. As set out in my banners there are two appeals. They relate to separate developments that have been carried out. I have considered each development on its individual merits, but to avoid duplication, I have dealt with the two appeals together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. In the interests of clarity, and as both schemes involve replacement windows to the front of the property, in my formal decision on Appeal A I have added the words 'at ground floor' to the description of the development; and I have taken the amended description of Appeal B in my banner from the appeal form.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Dover House Estate Conservation Area ('the DHECA').

Reasons

6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, set out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
7. 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') is broadly consistent with that approach, and requires the conservation of features and elements that contribute to a heritage asset's significance and character.
8. The Dover House Estate Conservation Area Appraisal ('the CAA') sets out that the DHECA's special character is derived from the carefully planned clusters of picturesque cottage-style homes, and their front gardens with privet hedges set around green spaces with many mature trees. The estate was built by the London County Council in the 1920s, with its layout and design philosophy influenced by the Garden City Movement. It continues that each cottage is part of a carefully considered terrace or pair, the special character of which is reliant on the uniformity of design features such as doors, windows and porches.
9. At section 7.7 it describes that there is a mix of timber sash, casement, and metal 'crittall' windows on different parts of the estate, with glazing bars dividing the glass into small 'cottage style' panes. The accompanying plan shows that the appeal site is in one of only two small areas where a mix of crittall ground floor, and timber first floor, windows were used.
10. At section 8.0 the CAA says that noticeable changes to small design features can have a detrimental effect upon the appearance of the area. This includes changes to the size of an original window opening, or unsuitable replacements which fail to replicate the original in terms of materials, design or profile.
11. The host sits within a short cohesive terrace of four properties from Nos 190 to 184 (evens). The terrace terminates with a hipped roof, and is finished in pantiles with centrally positioned front facing dormers, and its walls are buff brickwork. Its style, form and design are typical of the area, and it undoubtedly makes a positive contribution to the DHECA.
12. Given the host's unenclosed forecourt, the double-glazed aluminium framed ground floor window, which I understand replaced an original crittall window, is clearly visible from Dover House Road. However, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 3 of the appeal statement, the ground floor front facing windows in this terrace are very diverse in terms of their style and proportions.
13. Whilst this small window has different materials and detailing, and a slightly higher cill height, compared to the crittall window it replaced, it broadly matches the size

and alignment of the neighbouring ground floor window at No 186. Although that window may not have planning permission, the scheme's white colour and its multi-paned design also respect the other windows in this terrace, and in those regards it also reflects the broad characteristics of windows in the wider area. Furthermore, given landscaped screening, there are few, if any, views of the whole ground floor front face of this terrace in the streetscene.

14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the replacement window in Appeal A has not harmed the character and appearance of the host property, the cohesion of this terrace, or the significance of the DHECA. Consequently, it does not conflict with WLP Policy LP3, or with the general requirement in WLP Policy LP1 for high quality design which relates positively to local character. Neither does it conflict with the Framework.
15. Turning to Appeal B, whilst the appellant maintains that the host's pre-existing dormer was larger than the others in this terrace, having regard to Figures 2 and 3 of her statement, any such difference was barely perceptible. She also states that the dormer is not larger than the pre-existing dormer, as the original frame and form were retained and only the external cladding was replaced.
16. However, whilst the scheme may not have resulted in more internal space, as illustrated by drawing no P_04-Rev A, measured externally it is larger than the pre-existing dormer. Its dark grey zinc cladding also jars with the white coloured finish of the other front dormers in this terrace, and adds to its apparent bulk, and it therefore appears visually much larger than them.
17. As demonstrated by Figure 10 of her statement, and as I witnessed on my visit, given its elevated position, its proportions, and its dark grey zinc cladding, the dormer stands out as an incongruous feature, which disrupts the cohesion and balance of this typical small cluster of cottages in the streetscene.
18. Although the Council approved a dormer with zinc cladding to the rear of the host¹, as it is to the rear elevation where there was no existing dormer, its context is significantly different compared to this scheme.
19. The roof tiles appear to match the profile and general colour of the originals they replaced, and I agree with the Council that they have not caused any harm. However, I am not persuaded that planning conditions could be used to address the harm that the dormer has caused.
20. Finally, whilst I note the appellant's procedural concerns regarding the Council's handling of her application, including the alleged lack of communication, I have dealt with the scheme before me on its planning merits.
21. For the above reasons, I conclude that the scheme in Appeal B has harmed the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and it fails to preserve the significance of the DHECA. Thus, it conflicts with WLP Policies LP1 and LP3. Given the limited scale of the scheme, and in the context of the DHECA as a whole, the harm that has been caused to this designated heritage asset is less than substantial.
22. Although the pre-existing dormer may have suffered from water ingress, this scheme is not the only way in which that matter could have been rectified. I

¹ Ref: 2023/2649

understand that the dormer's increased external dimensions compared to the pre-existing dormer were due to the addition of insulation to improve energy efficiency. However, having regard to paragraph 215 of the Framework, the harm that has been caused to the DHECA is not outweighed by that very modest public benefit. Thus, the scheme also conflicts with national planning policy.

Conclusion

23. I have found, in respect of the scheme in Appeal A, that the development has not harmed the character or appearance of the host property and that it preserves the character and appearance of the DHECA. Appeal A therefore succeeds.
24. However, the scheme in Appeal B has resulted in harm to the host property and it fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the DHECA. Having regard to the Framework, the harm caused is not outweighed by public benefits. Consequently, Appeal B is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR