



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2019

by Jamie Reed DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/19/3232204

32 Stanley Avenue, New Malden, Surrey, KT3 6EN

- 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 Dr Angelique Edwards against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 19/P1434, dated 29 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey flank extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey flank extension at 32 Stanley Avenue, New Malden, Surrey KT3 6EN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/P1434, dated 29 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: Site location plan and drawings 325A/2019/2, 325A/2019/3 and 325A/2019/4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey dwelling situated at the end of a short terrace of six properties. Stanley Road is characterised by small terraces of this nature, which are separated by gated alleyways which provide access to land at the rear. Currently, the appeal property and its neighbour on the other side of the alleyway, No 34 Stanley Terrace have single storey extensions/garages to their sides. These are separated by one of the aforementioned alleyways.
4. A number of the dwellings in the area have been extended in differing ways, including 2 storey end terrace extensions, such as the one which is before me. The proposal would result in a 2 storey extension to the side of the appeal property of no greater width than the existing garage which it would replace. It

would run flush with the building line to the front of the property and its roof would be of the same form as the existing terrace, terminating with a gable end at the boundary of the site. As such, the proposal would read as a continuation of the form of the existing terrace.

5. The Council have raised concerns that as the extension does not feature a set-back from the front building line or a set-down in its roof height, it would not appear subordinate to the host property. It also considers the proposal would erode the important visual gap between the two terraces.
6. Notwithstanding the Council's views, it is clear that the proposal is in fact similar to a number of other developments elsewhere in the street, the details of some of which at No 19¹ and No 44² have been provided by the appellant. These particular examples also feature flush side extensions and continuations of their respective terrace's rooflines. Whilst I can accept that the Council would normally expect to see a more subordinate form of extension, the pattern of development in this particular street is characterised by developments such as the one that is before me. Furthermore, the alleyways effectively prevent the short terraces from joining together, as would be the case in this instance. Furthermore, as No 34 does not feature a two storey extension to its side, both this current form of development and the intervening alleyway would ensure that there is a suitable gap/sense of space between the two terraced blocks. As a result, the extension would not cause harm to the overall design or proportions of the existing dwelling or to the general character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would assimilate well with the existing pattern of development in this area and would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations 2016); Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy 2011, or Policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the London Borough of Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014. When read together, these policies require proposals to be of a high quality design that relates positively to and respects, reinforces and enhances the local character of the area in which it is located, including the spaces between buildings.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also included a condition requiring that the materials used match the appeal property, in order to ensure that the development is in-keeping with the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions.

Jamie Reed

INSPECTOR

¹ Application Ref: 18/P0705

² Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/14/2224408