
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/20/3257457

416 Durnsford Road, Wimbledon Park, London SW19 8DZ

- 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 and Mrs G Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 20/P1550, dated 5 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey ground floor rear extension at 416 Durnsford Road, Wimbledon Park, London SW19 8DZ in accordance with the terms of application Ref 20/P1550, dated 5 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: 416.P4.01; 416.P4.02; 416.P4.03; 416.P4.04; 416.P4.05; Red Line Location Plan; and Proposed Block Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall be those specified in the application form.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed rear extension on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - ii) the living conditions of neighbours at 414 and 418 Durnsford Road, with particular reference to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling house. The proposed rear extension would adjoin an existing part two storey, part single

storey rear addition that is currently under construction, but nearing completion¹. The proposed extension would measure approximately 6.65m in length, while having an eaves and ridge height of approximately 2m and 3m respectively.

4. Policy DM D3 of the Site and Policies Plan and Policies Map (2014) (the SPP) requires that extensions to buildings to respect and compliment the design and detailing of the original dwelling, including its form, scale, bulk and proportions. In the case of the appeal property, it has a rear roof extension and the part two storey, part single storey extension referred to above. These have cumulatively increased the mass of the dwelling, while also altering the appearance of the original dwelling's rear façade, by partially obscuring the rear outrigger and rear roof plane.
5. The proposed rear extension would elongate the dwelling, however, it would have an eaves and ridge height that would sit below that of the single storey extension it would adjoin, ensuring it would be subordinate in scale. It would also respect the prevailing hierarchy of additions that extend from the dwelling's rear, in terms of height and bulk. The proposal's pitched roof would be consistent with the roof form of the property's rear outrigger ensuring symmetry in appearance, while it would also be constructed in materials to match the rest of the dwelling. Therefore, whilst much of the dwelling's original form and scale has changed at the rear, the proposed extension would not result in any unacceptable harm to its existing scale and design.
6. The proposed extension would be longer than any of the existing rear additions I saw during my site visit. However, the appeal property is located in a sequence of dwellings that has a staggered front building line resulting in the rear elevations of properties stepping away from one another. In this context the proposed extension would not appear to project excessively beyond the rear elevations of existing dwellings a short distance to the south at Nos 410 and 412. Furthermore, the proposal's relatively low height coupled with the presence of existing garden trees along property boundaries in the immediate locality, ensure it would not appear overly prominent when viewed from gardens and windows of neighbouring dwellings. On this basis, I do not consider that the proposal would appear incongruous or out of context amongst the adjacent dwellings.
7. The proposed extension would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would comply with Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the SPP and Policy CS14 of the LDF Core Planning Strategy, adopted, July 2011. These require proposals, amongst other considerations, to respect the local character of the area and respond to the siting, scale, use of materials and proportions of surrounding buildings.

Living Conditions

8. The dwellings either side of the appeal property, Nos 414 and 418, have long but narrow rear gardens that are enclosed by close boarded fencing. The proposed extension would project beyond the rear elevations of these neighbouring dwellings and be partially visible from their internal rooms and garden areas. However, it would not have a significant enclosing or shading effects on these properties given the proposal's marginal increase in height

¹ Planning Permission Ref 19/3734

above the existing boundary fences and because the roof of the proposal would slope away. Moreover, neighbouring first floor rooms relating to No 418 are elevated above the proposed extension and consequently would not have their outlook or light adversely affected.

9. Assessing the scheme against the existing and proposed site circumstances show that the changes would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 414 and 418 Durnsford Road with regard to daylight and outlook. The proposed extension would therefore comply with Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the SPP, which amongst other things, require proposals, to ensure appropriate levels of daylight to adjoining buildings and gardens, and that living conditions of occupiers are not diminished through visual intrusion.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions, amending or omitting them where necessary for clarity and to ensure compliance with the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework.
11. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have considered it necessary to include a schedule of plans that the development relates to, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to the construction of the extension in materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR