



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/21/3273328
110 Fleming Mead, Mitcham, CR4 3LW

- 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 D Detka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 20/P3801, dated 29 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion, roof alterations to the main roof and the roof over the recently approved side extension including installation of one roof light to the front slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's reason for refusing the application refers to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which relate to the quality of design and its appropriateness in terms of the local context. That plan has since been superseded by the London Plan 2021 (LP) published in March 2021. Policy D3 of the LP sets similar requirements for development with respect to the quality of design. I have therefore determined the appeal with regard to Policy D3 and am satisfied that neither party will be caused an injustice by taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and area.

Reasons

4. Fleming Mead mainly comprises 2 storey semi-detached and terraced housing. The appeal site is an end house in a terrace of 6 properties. Similarly sized terraces in the vicinity of the appeal site have hipped roofs at each end, as is the case with the appeal property and the house at the opposite end of its terrace.
5. The proposal is to add a gambrel roof to an existing side extension, linked to the main roof to enable the loft to be extended and converted. The appellant claims that the design is intended to reflect that of housing opposite the appeal site. However, the housing opposite comprises a very different design to that of

the host dwelling and adjoining houses, as do other houses which the appellant cites with alternative roof forms.

6. The proposed gambrel roof would be at odds with the hipped roof it would replace, and with the hipped roof at the other end of the terrace. As such it would unbalance the appearance of the terrace and be out of character with other, similarly sized, terraces within the street. Consequently, the host dwelling would appear out of place and incongruous.
7. Overall, I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene and as such the proposal would conflict with Policy D3 of the LP, Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and Policies DMD2 and DMD3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (2014) which require development to reinforce and enhance the local character of the area and ensure that roof forms respect the characteristics of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR