



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by R A Exton Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/17/ 3181716

76 Clarence Road, Wimbledon, London SW19 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 Mr & Mrs Su against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 17/P1891, dated 9 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed single storey and first floor rear extensions incorporating open plan living/dining/day room and bedroom with en suite over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of No 76 Clarence Road and the surrounding area; and ii) the living conditions of occupiers of No 78 Clarence Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 76 Clarence Road comprises a mid-terrace dwelling on the southern side of the road. The proposal relates to its rear elevation which has been previously altered by the addition of a projecting canopy at ground level and a dormer window at roof level. Whilst other dwellings in the vicinity have also been altered by the addition of single storey rear and roof extensions, there is an absence of two storey rear extensions that would be viewed in the same context as the proposal.
4. The rear elevation of No 76 can be seen from the part of Ashley Road that links Clarence Road and Florence Road. The proposal and its two storey element in particular, would be particularly prominent from this viewpoint. It would fill the whole width of the rear garden and as such appear as a bulky and dominant addition that would be out of character with the relatively simple form of No 79. The use of matching materials and appropriate detailing would do little to mitigate this effect.

5. The roof of the two storey element would form an awkward junction with No 76, cutting through its second floor eaves level. Although overall lower than the roof of No 76 this, and the absence of other two storey extensions in the vicinity would also make the proposal appear uncharacteristic when viewed in the context of the terraced row of which it forms part.
6. My attention has been drawn to two storey rear extensions on other properties on Clarence Road and other streets in the vicinity of the appeal site, some of which I observed on my site visit. These are not viewed in the same context as the appeal proposal and so do not bear direct comparison with it. In any event, I have considered the proposal on its own merits in light of the policies and evidence before me and the existence of the other developments does not lead me to a different conclusion.
7. In light of the above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with policies DM D1, DM D2 and DM D3 of the London Borough of Merton's Local Plan adopted 2014 ('the Local Plan'), and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan adopted 2015 ('the London Plan'). These require alterations to existing buildings to respond positively to local character and appearance.

Living conditions

8. Properties either side of No 76 have single storey rear extensions of differing forms. The extension to No 78 Clarence Road does not fill the full width of the rear elevation. Consequently, a ground floor window would be set back some 5m from the furthest projection of the proposal which would be built with no separation from the shared boundary, the part closest to the dwelling at two storey height. This would result in a significant loss of outlook and sense of enclosure to occupiers. Whilst I note the current occupant's satisfaction with this arrangement, it would not provide a satisfactory standard of living conditions for future occupiers.
9. In light of the above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with policy DM D2 of the Local Plan and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan. These require that development proposals ensure appropriate quality of living conditions and avoid harm to adjoining buildings.
10. Taking into account the path of the sun and the relative positions of the proposal and the rear window to No 78, I consider the proposal would not cause significant loss of light to the occupiers of No 78.

Conclusion

11. Whilst I find no harm to the living conditions of occupiers of No 78 resulting from loss of light, the harm resulting from loss of outlook and sense of enclosure, together with the harm to the character and appearance of No 76 and the surrounding area justify the refusal of planning permission. For these reasons and taking into account all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Exton

INSPECTOR