

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/16/3161555

11 Mawson Close, Wimbledon Chase, London, SW20 9PA

- 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 Ms Jane Black against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref: 16/P2684 was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is: Demolition of existing garage. Erection of single storey side addition.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 8 February 2017.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side addition at 11 Mawson Close, Wimbledon Chase, London, SW20 9PA 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, 1487-10 site plan, 1487-1 existing floor plans, 1487-2 existing elevations, 1478-3 Rev.A proposed floor plans and 1478-4 Rev.A proposed elevations.
 4. Access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No.11 Mawson Close is a two storey end-terrace dwelling with a detached garage to the side. It is located within a cul-de-sac that has dwellings of a

similar design and materials. New development in the vicinity includes a large 'Bellway' apartment block

4. The existing garage would be demolished and replaced by a single storey side extension that would fill the almost triangular space between the main flank wall of No.11 and the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at No.9 Mawson Close. The Council considers that the proposed extension would not adversely impact on the amenity of the occupants of No.9. I see no reason to disagree in view of the relatively low height of the proposed extension and lack of any significant harm in terms of increased loss of light/sunlight or loss of privacy for the neighbours.
5. The Council also considers that the proposed extension would be overbearing on the host dwelling and unsympathetic to the spacing and rhythm of dwellings within the street scene. However, although the extension would infill the gap between dwellings, it would have no significant harmful impact on the overall layout of development because it would replace the wooden fencing and pitched roof garage that already occupy part of the gap.
6. The proposed flat-roofed extension would not be particularly prominent when viewed from Mawson Close and not overbearing. This is because of its low height and design, whereby the front elevation would be angled back in line almost with the front elevation of the existing garage and in line with the front elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. There is also partial screening of the appeal site by frontage boundary hedges. Although there would be no offset of the extension from the front elevation of No.11 or the side boundary I consider that there would be no significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the streetscene.
7. The proposal would not conflict with policy CS14 of Merton's Core Strategy which requires that new development respects, reinforces and enhances the character of the area. There would be no conflict with Policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014, which expects development to relate positively and appropriately to the rhythm of surrounding buildings and street pattern or conflict with policy DM D3. This latter policy seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that proposals are well designed and respect the form, scale, bulk and proportions of the original building and its surroundings.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard timescale for commencement of development, conditions are included to ensure that the external materials complement those in the existing dwelling and requiring that development be in accordance with the approved plans. I have also added a condition to restrict use of the proposed flat roof in the interest of protecting the privacy of neighbours.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to a development at No.1 Mawson Close. However, that involved extensions of a different design to those proposed at the appeal site.

Conclusion

10. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR