

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: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/16/3149709

51 Herbert Road, London, SW19 3SQ

- 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 Colin Merrilees against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 16/P0964, dated 1 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear roof extension with a Juliette balcony and installation of 3 x rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interest of clarity I have used the description of development on the decision notice and appeal form in the banner heading above, as opposed to the description on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a self-contained flat that occupies one half of the upper floor of a 2-storey building comprising a total of 4 flats. The building forms part of a planned development comprising very similar 4-unit blocks of flats arranged around a grassed area of public open space. The building comprising the appeal property and the one containing 36, 38, 40 and 42 Herbert Road are arranged symmetrically to either side of, and at 90 degrees to, the road and form a "gateway" to the public open space when approached from the south. As a consequence the rear roof slopes of these buildings are visible from the street and the 2 buildings are a key constituent of the formal planned arrangement of the area.
 5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a large dormer above the entire width of the rear of the appeal property. This would be similar in size and siting to rear roof additions on other properties in Herbert Road. In addition I
-

note that a number of the older properties in Graham Road include rear dormers of varied size and design. However, these rear roof additions are not evident to any great degree from Herbert Road or the open space. By contrast, the appeal proposal would be highly visible from Herbert Road and would result in the disruption of the clear symmetry between the 2 blocks to either side of the road. I therefore conclude that, due to its siting and size, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. For these reasons the proposal fails to comply with Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Council's *Sites and Policies Plan* (2014) which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new development relates positively and appropriately to the siting, scale and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns and urban layout. There is also clear conflict with the Council's *Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions* (2001) and the broad aims of Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Merton *LDF Core Planning Strategy* (2011).

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised including the absence of objections from neighbouring residents, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR