



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by S Thomas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/20/3246780

22 Cannon Close, Raynes Park, London SW20 9HA

- 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 Roger Cook against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 19/P2217, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of new build (98sqm) providing a end of terrace 3 bedroom house attached to 22 Cannon Close.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice cites policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016). However, this Plan was replaced by the London Plan (2021) on 2 March 2021. The parties have had the opportunity to comment on the implications of this for the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling. Whilst there is a variation in property types along Cannon Close, the properties within the terrace are characterised by a similar design approach and proportions, incorporating bay windows and projecting front gables providing a degree of visual symmetry in the street scene.
5. The proposed attached dwelling would occupy an area to the side of the dwelling currently occupied by a garage. Because of the tapered boundary, the site widens towards the rear. To fit within the site, the proposed attached dwelling would have an almost triangular-shaped floor plan resulting in a very a narrow front elevation and a large angled flank wall. The odd shape of the building and resulting roof form would appear contrived and uncharacteristic within Cannon Close. Although the proposal would not exceed the ridge height of the terrace, its design would disrupt the symmetry of the terrace. It would

create an incongruous feature in the street scene. Whilst there is some boundary vegetation on the side boundary, this would not effectively mitigate the intrusive impact of the proposal.

6. I have had regard to the existing development (Arun Court) opposite the appeal site. Whilst this is a relatively substantial building with angled walls, it appears as a standalone building and blends well with its surroundings. It is viewed in an entirely different context to the terrace and, unlike the appeal proposal, avoids a contrived and incongruous appearance.
7. In respect of 7a Cannon Close, this is an individual dwelling at the end of the close and is not comparable to the appeal proposal. Similarly, whilst there are end of terrace examples with side extensions, these are generally modest one-storey additions and so are not comparable to the appeal proposal. I note the appellant's reference to other properties along Grand Drive, but these are not within the immediate street scene and so are not directly relevant to this appeal. Accordingly, the above examples do not persuade me the appeal proposal would be acceptable.
8. For the reasons above, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and Policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (2014). Together, amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that development is designed to respect, reinforce and enhance the character of the area, to contribute to Merton's sense of place and identity, relate positively and appropriately to rhythm, scale and proportions and massing of surrounding buildings and urban layout of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the proposal would be acceptable in terms of amenity space and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, the absence of harm with respect to these matters cannot justify the proposal. I accept the scheme would represent an effective use of land and contribute to the area's housing stock. However, given the proposal would provide only one additional dwelling, any benefits associated with it would be modest and would not outweigh the harm I have found. Overall, I find that the proposal does not comply with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

S Thomas

INSPECTOR