



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/21/3269658

First floor flat, 10 Hamilton Road, South Wimbledon, London SW19 1JF

- 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 Kimberley Bachelot against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 20/P3196, dated 30 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is L shaped loft conversion including two roof lights in the front roof slope and raising the ridge by 300mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an L shaped loft conversion including two roof lights in the front roof slope and raising the ridge by 300mm at first floor flat, 10 Hamilton Road, South Wimbledon, London SW19 1JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 20/P3196 dated 30 September 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule to this decision.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Kimberley Bachelot against the Council of the London Borough of Merton. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
4. The development includes raising the ridge height of the roof, the construction of an L shaped rear dormer window and the insertion of two rooflights in the front roof slope. The reasons for refusal on the Council's decision notice indicate that the raising of the ridge height of the roof is the matter in dispute. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion that the rest of the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms. My reasoning below therefore relates to the raising of the roof.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey mid terrace property split into two flats currently undergoing refurbishment. The area has a tight but pleasant urban grain largely comprising terraced and semi-detached properties. A number of properties have been altered by increasing the roof ridge height and inserting roof lights. These alterations have resulted in noticeable variations of the roofscape along Hamilton Road.
7. The proposal would change the gradient and increase the ridge height of the roof altering the appearance of the host property. However, I find that the scale of the proposal would be modest and proportionate to the host property and would not unduly harm its appearance.
8. The proposal would not be overly obtrusive but rather it would relate well to the host property and the street scene respecting the design of nearby properties and reflecting the varied appearance of the area, which includes a number of properties with taller ridge heights.
9. Despite there being no recent examples, increased ridge heights and a varied roofscape are nonetheless notable features that make up part of the area's character and appearance. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed development would be in keeping with the scale and appearance of development in the area.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would accord with Policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (2014), Policy CS 14 of the London Borough of Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals relate positively and appropriately to surrounding buildings and street patterns; use appropriate architectural forms, detailing and materials which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting; designed to respect, reinforce and enhance the local character of the area; have regard to the form, function and structure of an area and incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context.

Conditions

11. I have considered the imposition of conditions in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard three-year time limit condition for implementation; I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above the appeal succeeds.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 plans: Block and Location Plans Drawing Number 101(P); Existing Plans Drawing Number 102(P); Existing Plans Drawing Number 103(P); Existing Elevations Drawing Number 104(P); Existing Elevations Drawing Number 105(P); Proposed Plans Drawing Number 106C(P); Proposed Plans Drawing Number 107C(P); Proposed Elevations Drawing Number 108C(P); Proposed Elevations Drawing Number 109C(P); Existing and Proposed Sections Drawing Number 110C(P) and Existing and Proposed Sections Drawing Number 111C(P).
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the host property.