
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2017

by S Jones MA(Oxon) DipLP

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

Decision date: 22 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/17/3170406

78 Dundonald Road, Wimbledon, London SW19 3PN

- 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 Tina Tay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 16/P3754, dated 31 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is second storey mansard loft extension with alterations to existing loft extension.
-

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 the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The property is a modest sized end of terrace opposite Dundonald Park in a suburban area of similar modest sized terraces. It is in a prominent position on the corner of William Road cul-de-sac and Dundonald Road. It has already had previous extensions, including a large rear dormer extension on the main roof.
 4. This proposal is for a larger rear roof extension across the majority of the rear roof area and along the rear wing. I conclude that because of its size, design and location it would be unacceptably dominant and visually prominent on this particular site, and in combination with the existing extensions would amount to a significant addition to the existing dwelling. It would be of a size and scale that was not in proportion with the host dwelling, its plot, and the surrounding buildings.
 5. It is noted that this is an improved scheme slightly different to that submitted under appeal APP/T5720/D/13/2200785, and that there is a demand for larger family homes in this area. However, despite the adjustments in design, I consider that this cannot overcome the harm that will arise from the scale and size of the development.
 6. Consequently I conclude that it would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, as it would conflict with the 2011 Merton Core Planning Strategy Policy 14 which promotes
-

good design that respects, reinforces and enhances local character, and with Policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the 2014 Merton Sites and Policies Plan and the 2001 Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions Supplementary Planning Guidance, which provide for appropriately sized and designed extensions which respect, complement and enhance the existing situation by relating appropriately to it, including to the proportions of the original building and the surrounding context.

7. I appreciate that there are number of other dwellings nearby which have rear mansards and other extensions, many of which are included in the appeal statement. Although I do not propose to reiterate these individually, I note that none of them are completely identical to this particular site in terms of their prominence, location and configuration. I am not aware if all developments referred to had or required planning permission, or what previous policies may have applied. I have concluded that this particular scheme on this particular site is unacceptable for the reasons given above.

Conclusion

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

S Jones

INSPECTOR