

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2016

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/16/3154383

74 Arthur Road, Wimbledon, London SW19 7DS

- 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 Paul Higginson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 15/P2614, dated 26 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the creation of an additional floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and the setting of the neighbouring locally listed building.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a dwelling that presents a 2-storey frontage to Arthur Road and 3 storeys arranged in a series of steps to the rear, where the land falls steeply. It is attached to the flank wall of 76 Arthur Road, which is a substantial, handsome locally listed property. On the other side there is a narrow gap between the appeal property and the 2-storey side wing of 72 Arthur Road. The property is situated within a part of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area that is characterised by substantial detached houses set in relatively large and verdant plots. The gaps between these properties are a key constituent of the character and appearance of the Area and a matter to which I attach significant weight.
 4. The appeal property is located a significant distance behind the front building line of No. 76 and is lower and therefore subordinate to this property. However, it is set only a small distance behind the frontage of No. 72 and extends above the eaves level of the adjacent side wing. As a consequence, compared to other structures and additions between the original houses in the area, the appeal property is a prominent element in the street scene.
-

5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a mansard addition above the top floor, which would be slightly set in from all elevations. Whilst in views from the road the appeal property would remain subordinate in scale to No. 76, it would dominate the side wing of No. 72 and make an already prominent property more so, further denuding the prominence of the original houses to either side. Due to its size and siting I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the street scene.
6. Due to its significant rearward projection and width at the rear the appeal property is a substantial structure that dominates, and in my judgement, harms the setting of No. 76 when viewed from the rear. The proposal would add further height and bulk next to the locally listed building that would result in additional, and unacceptable, harm to its setting.
7. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and would have an unacceptable effect on the setting of No. 76 and the appearance of the street scene. It therefore fails to comply with Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 of the Council's Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (2014), and Policy CS14 of the Core Planning Strategy (2011). These policies seek development that relates positively and appropriately to surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, and conserve Merton's heritage assets and distinctive character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR