
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/16/3164506

12 Wool Road, West Wimbledon, London, SW20 0HW

- 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 Mike Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 16/P1963 dated 12 May 2016 was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension to north of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension to north of dwelling at 12 Wool Road, West Wimbledon, London, SW20 0HW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/P1963, dated 12 May 2016 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (Dwg No: 6842-PL-100), Existing Ground Floor Plan (Dwg No: 6842-E-002 Rev: B), Existing First Floor Plan (Dwg No: 6842-E-003 Rev: B), Existing Second Floor Plan (Dwg No: 6842-E-004 Rev: B), (Existing Roof Plan Dwg No: 6842-E-005 Rev: B), Existing Elevations (Dwg No: 6842-E-006 Rev: B), Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Dwg No: 6842-PL-103), Proposed First Floor Plan (Dwg No: 6842-PL-104), Proposed Roof Plan (Dwg No: 6842-PL-105), Proposed East & West Elevations (Dwg No: 6842-PL-106) and Proposed North & South Elevations (Dwg No: 6842-PL-107).
 - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, including window frames and doors have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no openings, other
-

than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the side (northern) elevation of the extension hereby permitted.

- 5) Demolition or construction works including deliveries shall take place only between 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturday, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated on the corner of Wool Road and Dunstall Road within the Wool Road Conservation Area. The area is predominantly residential and comprises mainly of two storey detached properties situated close to each other. There is variation in the built form of properties with some displaying elements of Tudor and Georgian styling. The individuality that the buildings exhibit contributes to the character of the area. Many of the properties are set back behind front garden areas that contain vegetation, which alongside grass verges and street trees, contributes to the verdant and spacious character of the area.
4. The proposal seeks permission for a single storey side extension with a width of 3.5m. It would bring the appeal building closer to the road and whilst noting its maximum height of 4.5m, given its pitched roof form, the height of the extension at the point where it is closer to road would be 2.7m. I acknowledge that it would be forward of the building line along Dunstall Road and be visible from the public domain. However, the adjacent property to the rear is separated from it by the long rear garden of the appeal building, and I do not therefore consider that this forward siting would be apparent. The proposed extension would also still be separated by a distance of around 2.2m from the side boundary. Given this set back from the side boundary, its single storey form, and the height of the boundary treatment, which consists of a boundary wall and fence in combination with vegetation adjacent to it, I do not consider that the development would adversely affect the open and spacious character of the area.
5. I note the references to the Wool Road Conservation Area Character Assessment (Character Assessment) which states that the extensive front garden areas are a direct result of the restrictions placed by the Estate owners to have a building line set back 20 feet from the street boundaries. My attention has also been drawn to a historical plan within the Wool Road Conservation Area Design Guide which illustrates this set back. Although this development would not maintain this distance and result in the loss of some open space, having regard to the extension's siting and height as well as the screening provided by vegetation along the boundary, I do not consider that the proposal would unduly reduce the sense of openness in this corner location. The greenery and trees within front garden areas, which the Character Assessment identifies as giving the area much of its character, would also not be affected by the development, which would be set back from the front of the existing dwelling. Reference has also been made to the removal of the

boundary treatment at the appeal property but there is no evidence before me that indicates that this is reasonably likely to occur particularly as the development is set away from the boundaries.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It would not conflict with Policy CS14 of the Council's Core Strategy or Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 of the Council's Sites and Policies Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to conserve Merton's heritage assets and achieve high quality design. It would also not conflict with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Although reference has been to UDP Policies, I have not been provided further details of these.

Other Matters

7. Reference has been made to the setting of a precedent by this appeal proposal. Although there are other corner locations within the Conservation Area, I am determining this appeal on its own merits and any future application or appeal would also be considered on its own circumstances.
8. Concern has also been raised about the extension affecting sight lines at this corner location. The proposal would however be set back from the highway and it would not therefore unacceptably affect visibility splays.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above and having taken into account all other matters raised, including the planning history of the site and reference to other guidance, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

10. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I consider the standard implementation condition and a condition for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to be necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will impose a condition in relation to material samples to be submitted for approval in the interests of the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area, although it is not then also necessary for a condition to be imposed that requires materials to match the existing building.
11. A condition is also necessary to prevent new openings on the side elevation of the extension hereby approved, although the side elevation is the northern and not the southern elevation as referenced by the Council. The suggested condition relating to the hours of construction will also be imposed in the interests of living conditions of surrounding occupiers. The wording of some of the conditions has been amended in the interests of accuracy and enforceability.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR