

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: 28 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/16/3152709

7 Lambourne Avenue, London SW19 7DW

- 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 Cherwell (7 Lambourne Ave) Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 15/P2830, dated 15 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing house and construction of new building to create 2no. 6-bedroomed semi-detached family houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a 2-storey detached dwelling set in a relatively large plot. It is located in a residential cul-de-sac that slopes markedly downwards from Arthur Road and includes a turning head at its end next to the appeal site. As a result both the front boundary and a large proportion of the lower side boundary of the site abut the pavement and the existing house occupies a particularly prominent, exposed and elevated position in the street scene.
 4. Lambourne Avenue was formed in the latter half of the 20th century and now contains a mix of original houses, many of which have been extended and altered, and replacement dwellings. Most notably the next door house, 5 Lambourne Avenue, was built in 2015 and No.3 has recently been extended at roof level and to the rear. Whilst these properties have become larger, the width of their street frontages appears to have remained the same.
 5. The appeal proposal would involve the demolition of the existing house and erection of a semi-detached pair of 6-bedroom dwellings including basement and attic level accommodation. The front building line of the proposal would
-

line through with that of its neighbours and an adequate gap would be maintained between the proposal and No. 5.

6. Whilst the eaves of the proposal would be at a similar level above ground as the neighbouring properties, so that the stepping arrangement in the street would be maintained in this respect, this would not be the case with regard to the roof ridge which would only be marginally below that of No. 5. The principal frontage would be far wider than its neighbours as would the exposed side elevation. Although the proposal's design would reflect the formal arrangement of No. 5, it would be far grander in terms of its scale and proportions than its neighbours.
7. Taken together, the matters outlined above would result in an overly dominate and prominent building that would be out of scale and out of keeping with its immediate context. I therefore conclude that, due to its size, siting and design the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and would have an unacceptable effect on the street scene.
8. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policy DM D2 of the Council's *Sites and Policies Plan* (2014) (SPP) which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that new development relates positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height and massing of surrounding buildings. There is also conflict with SPP Policy DM D4 which states that proposals affecting a heritage asset or its setting should conserve and enhance the significance of the asset. The proposal is also contrary to the broad aims of Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Merton *LDF Core Planning Strategy* (2011).

Other Matters

9. I am satisfied that the loss of on-street car parking spaces and provision of additional off-street parking would not result in harm to highway safety or parking stress in the street, and that the proposal would not result in unacceptable loss of light to the next door property. These matters do not however outweigh my concerns in respect of the main issues.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR