
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2020

by R. Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/20/3250538

14 Evesham Green, Morden SM4 6PW

- 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 Gilbert Gibson against the decision of London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 20/P0413, dated 24 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of part single part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host house and area.

Reasons

3. No.14 Evesham Green (No.14) comprises a two-storey semi-detached house located at an oblique angle on a prominent corner of Evesham Green. The house forms part of the wider St Helier Estate built in the 1930s. The surrounding area is characterised by short rows of two-storey terraced houses, with pairs of semi-detached houses on corner plots. Although houses have been altered and extended, they are typically brick built with hipped roof forms and there is a uniformity to the character and appearance of the area. No.14 positively contributes to that character.
4. Extending only around 1.5m from the rear building line of No.14 and around 5.4m in height with a mono-pitched roof, the extension would be modest in scale. Its corner location means that there are clear first floor views of the rear of No.14 from both Evesham Green and Egleston Road and, because of its scale, the extension would not be legible appearing as a somewhat alien addition to the rear of the host house. Further, although modern interventions can be successful, the mono-pitched roof form would fail to integrate well with the traditional roof form of the house and the steep hip of the previous front and side extension. In combination, its scale and roof form mean the extension would appear an incongruous addition to the house detracting from the characteristic uniformity of the streetscene.

5. The use of black cladding has been designed to reinforce the extension as a modern addition to the house. Whilst this is successful, the contrast with the red brick of the house increases the prominence of the extension and therein exacerbates the uncomfortable relationship with its host. I therefore find that the first-floor element of the rear extension would cause harm to the No.14 and the character and appearance of the area.
6. As a consequence, the proposal would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) Policy CS14 and the Merton Local Plan Sites and Policies Plan (2014) policies DMD2 and DMD3 that, amongst other things, require proposals to be a high quality design and use architectural form, detailing and materials which complement the local character of an area.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to extensions approved elsewhere within the estate at No.26 Bayham Road (No.26) and No.2 Bindon Green (No.2). I note that the rear roof extension of No.26 was built under permitted development rights (PD rights) afforded by Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). No.26 and No.2 are a pair of semi-detached houses and have a similar corner location to No.14 Evesham Green. However, from the information I have seen, the proposals were for significant side extensions built in materials to match the existing houses. They are not therefore entirely comparable to the modest, modern rear extension before me.
8. My attention has also been drawn to No.27 Evesham Road located close to the appeal site. I saw from my site visit that this has a significant roof extension but note that this was also built under PD rights. Therefore, the cases referred to by the appellant can be clearly distinguished from the current proposal and lend no significant support to the appeal. Notwithstanding this, I am required to consider the appeal proposal on its individual merits.

Conclusion

9. For reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR