

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2016

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/16/3158290

12 Albert Grove, Raynes Park, London, SW20 8PY

- 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 and Mrs P Crome against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 16/P1754, dated 21 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof adjustment, loft conversion and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is two storey end-of-terrace dwelling with a hipped roof, which is situated in a visually prominent position on the corner of Albert Grove and Etherbert Road. The rear roof area of the building is particularly prominent when viewed from Etherbert Road. At my site visit, I noted that a number of other dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site have been extended and altered. Some of these include hip to gable extensions and flat-roofed dormer additions, some of which have been referred to by the appellant.
 4. The appeal proposal is to extend the roof of the dwelling by forming a gable facing onto Etherbert Road. In addition, a flat-roofed dormer would be constructed on the rear-facing roof. Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015 require (amongst other things) all new developments to reflect local character and to make a positive contribution to their surroundings. In addition, Policies DM2 and DM3 the Council's adopted Sites and Policies Plan 2014 (SPP) and Policy CS14 of the adopted Core Planning Strategy 2011 (CS) seek to ensure that all development is of high quality design. Policy DM3 also states that proposals for dormer windows should be of a size and design that respects the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context. Further guidance on the size and design of roof extensions is
-

contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions 2001 (SPG).

5. In reaching my decision, I have given careful consideration to the existence of other roof extensions in the locality and to the appellant's argument that alterations and extensions to the roof could be carried out under permitted development rights. However, I am required to assess the appeal proposal on its merits and, whilst the appellant's arguments are material considerations, I am not persuaded that they are overriding. Furthermore, in my opinion, many of the existing roof extensions to other properties do not make a positive visual contribution to the area.
6. I consider that the appeal proposal, taken as a whole, would appear as a dominant and unsympathetic addition to the property. It would be highly visible and incongruous in the streetscene when viewed from Etherbert Road, due to its overall size and bulk and it would fail to make a positive contribution to its surroundings. Accordingly, it would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and to the appearance of the streetscene.
7. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with the relevant policies of the Development Plan, as referred to above. It would also conflict with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which (amongst other things) requires planning to always secure high quality design and for new development to add to the overall quality of the area in which it is located. (paragraphs 17 and 58).

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR