
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/22/3291652

67 Oxford Avenue, Wimbledon Chase, London SW20 8LS

- 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 Mrs Juliette Morris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 21/P3356, dated 16 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a second floor extension above the existing outrigger at the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a second floor extension above the existing outrigger at the rear of the property in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/P3356, dated 16 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 67OA-P01, 67OA-P02, 67OA-P03, 67OA-P04, 67OA-P05, 67OA-P06 and 67OA-P07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

3. Typical of the houses on Oxford Avenue, No 67 is a 2 storey mid-terrace house with a lower 2 storey rear wing or outrigger – split with the neighbouring house, No 65. The main existing loft space of No 67 has already been converted, with a dormer extension that also covers part of the outrigger, with a sloping side wall. The proposal would continue this extension over almost all

- of the rest of No 67's half of the outrigger, at the same height as the main roof and with a straight side wall.
4. The Council's report records that there were not any nearby examples roof extensions of the depth proposed at the time the appeal application was refused. There is now, however, a very similar roof extension over the other half of this outrigger at No 65. The proposed extension would back onto this. It appears that it might be slightly taller, but otherwise would be of similar dimensions and design.
 5. Many of the houses in this row have various roof extensions, which are part of the established character here. In the only public view of the development, from a nearby footway/cycleway, the proposed extension would be some distance away and would sit against the new roof extension to No 65 so that it would not add any significant visual bulk to these roofs. In views from neighbouring properties the proposed extension would balance the roof of the outrigger.
 6. Sites and Policies Plan (SPP) Policy DMD3(viii) aims to ensure that dormer window extensions are of a size and design that respect the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context, do not dominate the existing roof profile and are sited away from prominent roof pitches, unless they are a specific feature of the area. In this case, the extension would dominate the existing roof, but would not be prominent in any public views and would more or less match an existing feature of the building. I find that in this case the proposed roof extension would fit into the local townscape without causing material harm, despite the scale and depth of the structure.
 7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the building or the local area. It accords with the aims of London Plan Policy D4, Core Planning Strategy Policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3, to ensure that development is of a high quality that respects, reinforces and enhances local character, with extensions complementing both the building and the wider setting.
 8. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty plus a condition requiring the use of matching materials to protect the character and appearance of the area. The Council has also suggested conditions regarding construction working hours and obscure glazing of a second floor side window, neither of which I consider to be necessary. Any nuisance caused by construction working on this small scale project could be dealt with through other legislation. There is an existing side window in place already so no new overlooking would be introduced. This window serves a bathroom so is likely to be obscure glazed in any case. Finally, the Wimbledon Swift Group has asked for a condition requiring installation of box(es) for use by swifts. Although the objective of helping swifts is worthy of support, I cannot see that this is a necessary requirement for this proposal, under current legislation and policy.
 9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR