



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30/08/17

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/17/3172691
39 Ethelbert Road, London, SW20 8QE

- 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 Mrs Josu Shephard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 16/P4449, dated 15 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension above the existing garage at 39 Ethelbert Road, London, SW20 8QE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/P4449, dated 15 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Nos 069-01, 069-02, 069-03, 069-04, 069-05 (Rev A), and 069-06 (Rev A).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which has been extended with a two-storey side extension and, attached to this, a single-storey garage. Both these additions lie flush with the original dwelling's front building line. The two-storey extension has a gable-ended roof to match that of No 41, its immediate neighbour, whilst the garage is overlain by a table-top or crown roof. Both dwellings are set back from the building line of No 37.
4. The proposal would involve part building over the garage with a first floor extension, again flush with the dwelling's frontage, and which would have a similar crown and a side pitch replicating that of the garage below. The new roof would be significantly lower than the main ridgeline.

5. Ethelbert Road has a mixture of residential building styles and, due to extensions added to both Nos 39 and 41, their original physical relationship has significantly altered. Both dwellings are now of individual appearance and No 41's original plot has also been severed with the erection of a new dwelling fronting the street. Further, the side garage erected to the appeal dwelling, although of a design which bears little relationship to the host dwelling, is of modest width and is subordinate to the host dwelling.
6. In this context I consider that the cumulative increase in width from the existing additions, and which would be increased further at first floor level, would have little effect on the general street scene. Neither do I consider that the height difference between the proposed extension's roof and the main ridgeline, or its particular design would be so bulky as to be overbearing in form or represent such a degree of general incongruity as to be unacceptable in its setting. The proposed use of materials, as set out on the application form, would also be appropriate, matching those of the existing dwelling. The fact that the dwelling sits behind the building line of No 37 reinforces my view.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or its surrounding area, and there would be no material conflict with the relevant objectives of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy CS14 of the Council's Core Strategy or Policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the Merton Sites and Policy Plan. These policies seek high quality design that respects the original building and the local character.
8. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. In the interests of certainty I impose a condition requiring that the development be implemented in accordance with the proposed plans. Further, in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance I also impose a condition requiring that the specified, matching external materials would be employed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR