

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2020

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/20/3248775

9 Belvedere Grove, Wimbledon Village, London SW19 7RQ

- 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 Barry Van Bergen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application, Ref. 20/P0176, dated 14 January 2020 was refused by notice dated 20 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of the existing pebble dash render with a new flat render.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of the existing pebble dash render with a new flat render at 9 Belvedere Grove, Wimbledon Village, London in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 20/P0176, dated 14 January 2020, 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. BG.P.120 & BG.P.121;
 - 3) The facing materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be an exact match for those at No. 11 ('Weber 091 Pearl Grey') and thereafter retained as such.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed flat render on the character and appearance of the locally listed building and the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is one half of the semi-detached pair Nos. 9-11 and that these are of the same design and age as two other pairs on this side of the road, Nos. 13 & 15 and 17 & 19. The three pairs are locally listed buildings and the symmetry of each pair, together with the matching external materials, make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
-

4. The exception to the matching materials is the recently permitted smooth render in place of the original pebbledash on the external surfaces of No. 11. The Council acknowledges that this was an error and that any permission should have stipulated a pebbledash finish to match No. 9 and the other two pairs in the group.
5. As regards the appeal proposal, whilst I support the general principle of the retention of the original pebbledash, the fact that No. 11 is now lawfully smooth rendered has resulted in the incongruity of a mis-match between the two buildings. In my view, this discordant appearance in the context of an otherwise perfect symmetry at the front is more harmful to the locally listed buildings and conservation area than a matching smooth render, which the appeal proposal would achieve.
6. Furthermore, as the grounds of appeal point out, smooth render is a common feature for buildings within the conservation area and I note that this includes the surface treatment for some other buildings and parts of in Belvedere Grove.
7. I am therefore satisfied that in the particular circumstances of this case the character and appearance of the locally listed buildings and the conservation area would be best preserved by allowing the appeal. This would be in accord with Policy CS14 of the Merton Core Strategy 2011; Policies DM D2, DM D3 & DM D4 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and Section 16 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
8. In allowing the appeal I have imposed two conditions in respect of compliance with the approved plans and matching No. 11, which taken together will ensure that this objective is achieved.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR