

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2020

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07/01/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/20/3258103

125 Pelham Road, Wimbledon, London SW19 1NZ

- 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 & Mrs Folkman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 20/P1206, dated 27 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extension to existing loft conversion to create L-Shaped dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was amended through the submission of revised plans, which I have relied upon.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 125 Pelham Road and the wider area, and upon the living conditions at 123 Pelham Road with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terraced, two-storey dwelling located within an area of similar aged and style of properties. No 125 has an existing two-storey rear projection across half the width of the building adjacent to No 123, together with a further single-storey rear extension and loft conversion, and three, rearward facing dormer windows. The proposal is to build a rear roof extension to create an L-shaped 'box-like' addition that would extend over almost the full depth of the existing two-storey projection.
5. The roof extension would completely change the original pitched roof profile of this terraced property to the rear, with a dominant second floor addition. However, my attention has been drawn to several examples of similar extensions to other like properties in the area, including a fairly recent grant of

planning permission at 75 Russell Road, where the new works to the roof are openly seen from the rear of the appeal site. I saw also a three-storey projection to the rear of the neighbouring property at 127 Pelham Road. During my visit I was also struck by many other large and bulky roof extensions in the wider area. These were visible from the public domain when viewing the backs of the terraces along the returns at the road junctions. Whilst these greatly varied in style, the result is that the original pitched roof profile to the rear of the terraces in the area was by no means dominant or the overriding character feature. Given this context, I find that the changes to the rear of No 125 would not look out of keeping with the surroundings or appear as unsympathetic alterations to the host property. In this regard, I find no conflict with Policies DM D2 *Design considerations in all developments* or DM D3 *Alterations and extensions to existing buildings* of the Council's Sites and Policies Plan 2014 (SPP), or with Policy CS14 *Design* of the Core Strategy 2011 insofar as they require development to be sympathetic and appropriately related to their surroundings.

6. No 123, attached to the appeal property, retains its original profile to the rear at first and second floor levels. The outlook from the first-floor rear windows is already impacted by the existing two-storey rear projection at No 125, which I understand was an extension to the original building that was granted planning permission around 2007. The addition of another storey above, immediately adjacent to the common boundary between both properties, would have a further and damaging impact upon the outlook from No 123 at this level. The flank wall of the appeal property would loom large and imposing when seen from within No 123, appearing overbearing and intrusive within an already tightly enclosed environment. Although it would not impact upon levels of direct sunlight, its enclosing impact would be likely to impact levels of natural daylight to the neighbour's internal living space at first floor. My impression overall is that the proposal would fail to ensure the quality of living conditions at No 123 that is required by SPP Policy DM D2.
7. I am mindful of all the other examples of roof alterations in the area that have influenced my findings with regard to the first main issue. However, I do not know the circumstances that prevail between neighbouring properties in these other cases. Although I was able to see many high-level roof alterations during my visit, I was not able to see the impact these have had upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. In this instance I have identified clear harm to the living conditions at No 123. Considering the appeal on its own merits, this leads me to conclude that the appeal should fail.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR