
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/16/3163510

153 Revelstoke Road, Wimbledon Park, London, SW18 5NN

- 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 Miss Sakiko Reuterskiold against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 16/P3692, dated 11 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is raising the roof level to create an additional bedroom in top floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building, and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a detached building with a height of two storeys, topped by a flat-sided roof. The appeal relates to the upper floor flat within the building, which is presently contained wholly within the roof space, effectively forming an additional floor of accommodation. The appeal proposal incorporates an increase in the mass and height of the roof, to accommodate another floor of accommodation, meaning that the appeal flat would be arranged over two floors within the internal roof space of the building.
 4. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and suburban in nature, with terraced houses contributing to a uniform character. The appeal building is an exception, having clearly different appearance and form to neighbouring homes, with the existing roof a notable deviation from the gabled roofs on neighbouring properties. The appeal site is bordered to the west by a raised railway line, beyond which is Wimbledon Park.
 5. The highest point of the existing roof is its central ridge, which runs most of the length of the building. The proposed works would raise the height of the roof's flat-sided street frontage, and although the overall height of the roof would be raised by 750mm, the existing ridge would be replaced by a flat roof section, adding to the massing near the top of the roof. These elements would combine to make the roof appear bulky and dominating on the building's front elevation. The roof would occupy a much larger proportion of the overall front elevation
-

when compared with neighbouring buildings, and in conjunction with the increased height, would appear obtrusive and incongruous.

6. The proposed works the rear and side elevations would be visible from the rear windows and gardens of neighbouring homes, and glimpsed from passing trains and within Wimbledon Park. Although the increased height of the building would be apparent the views of these elevations, the impact of its additional scale and mass would be reduced by the angled sides of the roof extension. The neighbouring buildings appear less uniform at the rear, having been altered by piecemeal extensions, including roof dormer extensions. In this context, the appearance of the proposed rear elevation would be acceptable, and would not unreasonably dominate the elevation in these views. Nonetheless, this absence of harm does not mitigate my concerns regarding the impact of the works on the appearance of the appeal building when viewed from the street, and its effects on the relationship between the building and its neighbours, which are sufficient to justify the dismissal of this appeal.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the Council's *LDF Core Planning Strategy* (2011) Policy CS14, and Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of its *Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps* document (2014). Together, these policies require the design of development to respect local character and the original building. In making my decision, I have also had regard to the Council's adopted *Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions Supplementary Planning Guidance Note* (2001).

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR