



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor (Non-practising)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/19/3230725

6 Worple Avenue, Wimbledon, London, SW19 4JQ

- 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 Arnie Vashisht against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 19/PO920, dated 1 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 126 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development given on the application form was the erection of a dormer to the front roof slope. However, a new description was agreed between the parties and the appeal was validated as the erection of a front roof extension. The description of development has therefore been taken from the appeal form and decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located on the northern side of the Worple Avenue cul-de-sac just outside the Wimbledon West Conservation Area (the CA). It comprises a two storey semi-detached residential property with a front driveway and rear garden located in the middle of the street. The surrounding area is characterised by its residential nature. The cul-de-sac is made up of a variety of flats, semi-detached and detached dwellings with the most prevalent style in the street being that of the appeal property, albeit with variances to the frontages.
6. The proposed development relates to the erection of a front roof extension, which would extend along the full width of the appeal property. I agree with the parties that the setting of the CA would not be affected by the proposal.

7. The extension has been designed in an attempt to match the existing property, with the south-eastern window mirroring the width and alignment of the bay windows below, and the use of red tiles to match the roof slope. Nonetheless, the full width scale would introduce a feature to the dwelling that would not respect the character and proportions of the property. The proposal would dominate the roof profile and, in doing so, would cause visual harm to the external appearance of the host building. It would appear disproportionate in the context of the building itself but would reduce the sense of coherence with the neighbouring dwelling.
8. The streetscape is varied with a mixture of skylights and dormer windows of various styles present. However, despite this the combination of the proposal's scale and the prominent plot within the cul-de-sac the extension would result in a sizeable addition. The proposal would not be experienced in the context of the other full width dormer extensions which are less visible at the end of the Worple Avenue and would therefore appear incongruous in the immediate setting. The character and proportions of the surrounding context would not be respected by the development.
9. I find that the development would have a significantly adverse visual effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Council of the London Borough of Merton Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

Other considerations

10. The appellant refers to permitted development for the installation of a rear dormer roof extension with two skylights to the front roof slope at the property as a fallback position. It is claimed that this would represent twice the volume of the proposal. However, for the reasons given above, the appeal proposal would be visually harmful compared to the fallback, because of the proposed extension's bulk and mass. Plainly, the proposal would be harmful even if there is a realistic prospect of a fallback position.
11. The appellant has also referred to other dormer extensions both on Worple Avenue and within the wider vicinity as proof that the concept of front dormer windows is acceptable. However, this proposal should be assessed on its own site-specific circumstances, and the presence of similar development nearby does not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR