

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2016

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/16/3163257

21 Bardney Road, Morden, SM4 5JL

- 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 Andrew Darling against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 16/P2654, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side extension with associated extension to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the planning application form; I note the appeal form also uses this description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey hipped roof dwelling on a rectangular corner plot. It has a single storey side extension projecting out towards and close to the side road, Bayham Road. The area is of established residential character with generally long terraces having simple front elevations which come together to form a pleasing streetscene. The proposal is as described above and by effectively adding a first floor over most of the existing side extension would provide for 2 additional bedrooms and an ensuite.
 5. Whilst the extension would be a relatively major change to the existing property by reason of its design, roof and set-backs, it could *in isolation* be of a form suited to the host property. At times and given a suitable plot there can be justification for new development which is not totally subservient to an original structure. I would therefore not be as critical as the Council in relation to any visual or character impact on the host property.
-

6. However one needs to look at the siting and wider context before reaching an overall determination on any proposal. The existing single storey side extension is something of an anomaly in that most corners locally do not have this degree of development in such proximity to the back edge of the pavement. Nevertheless its single storey nature allows for the sense of spaciousness to largely prevail. This spaciousness at corners is a marked and characteristic attribute of this area known as the St Helier Estate. The openness at corners brings a sense of visual relief to the long terraces and almost without exception has been retained over the years. The terrace frontages which run down the two relevant roads here are quite close to the pavement but the planned extension would be more tightly positioned and thus instead of the first floor corner development being more set back into a garden it would be quite the opposite. This would be jarring on the eye and be out of kilter with the pattern of local development.
7. In terms of relevant planning policies The London Plan includes Policy 7.4, The Core Strategy has Policy CS14 and the Sites and Policies Plan embodies Policies DM D2 and DM D3. Taken together, and amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure development is well designed; being sympathetic to the locality, respectful to a building's setting, protective of characteristic openness and having regard to local distinctiveness generally. Given the nature of the appeal scheme, I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to these policies.

Other matters

8. I sympathise with the wish of the Appellant to increase internal space and understand the family requirements and the constraints faced including the operational Childminding. I can sense the frustration over the decisions which have been reached and the apparent difficulties with respect to pre-application advice. I can see that thought has gone into the design and roof style in their own right and that matching materials are specified. I have reviewed the two examples of first floor corner located side extensions drawn to my attention and effectively the argument put that these are precedents. I did find however that there were marked differences locationally, in design terms, in the streets' context, and on the question of how local corners were handled and in building lines generally. In any event I must determine this case on its individual merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to a key part of the main issue identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Councils' policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, whilst I am content on the aesthetic effects of the proposal on the host property taken in isolation, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR