
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/21/3286540

299 Cannon Hill Lane, Raynes Park, London SW20 9HQ

- 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 and Mrs Beckett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 21/P2525, dated 2 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension at ground floor, a side extension at first floor over existing at ground floor and a hip to gable roof and ridge extension over proposed at first floor with a rear roof dormer and front roof fold-out balcony rooflights.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/T5720/D/21/3286541

299 Cannon Hill Lane, Raynes Park, London SW20 9HQ

- 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 and Mrs Beckett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 21/P2526, dated 2 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension at ground floor, a side extension at first floor over existing at ground floor and a hip to gable roof and ridge extension over proposed at first floor with front and rear roof dormers.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/T5720/D/21/3286540

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at ground floor, a side extension at first floor over existing at ground floor and a hip to gable roof and ridge extension over proposed at first floor with a rear roof dormer and front roof fold-out balcony rooflights at 299 Cannon Hill Lane, Raynes Park, London SW20 9HQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/P2525, dated 2 July 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Appeal B Ref: APP/T5720/D/21/3286541

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at ground floor, a side extension at first floor over existing at ground floor and a hip to gable roof and ridge extension over proposed at first floor with front and rear roof dormers at 299 Cannon Hill Lane, Raynes Park, London SW20 9HQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/P2526, dated 2 July 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main issue

3. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

4. 299 Cannon Hill Lane is an attractive and well detailed hipped roof semi-detached house sitting on a corner plot in an area of similar houses. The proposals for these 2 appeals share a number of key elements. Both include a first floor and roof extension (hip to gable and rear dormer) over an existing flat roofed, single storey side section, plus a flat roofed single storey rear extension. Both also include double height glazing on the new side gable wall.
5. The key difference is that Appeal A includes a set of rooflights on the front elevation which would fold out to provide a small balcony space within the line of the roof, while Appeal B includes a front dormer extension instead. I note that a third scheme has been granted planning permission by the Council, with a smaller hip to gable conversion but otherwise much the same extensions and alterations as are proposed in Appeal A.
6. The Council's concern is that the larger side extensions in both appeals and the front dormer in Appeal B would be incongruous and excessive development resulting in a loss of the building's form and imbalancing the pair of semis. I saw at my site visit that many houses within the local area have hip to gable extensions. Although this means that many of these other pairs of semi-detached houses are no longer symmetrical, this is not a crucial part of their character and this pattern of development is now well established locally.
7. I note also a similar side extension to another corner house not far away at 391 Cannon Hill Lane, which was allowed on appeal¹. This has been constructed and fits in well in the street scene. I recognise that No 391 is an end of terrace house instead of a semi and that there are other differences in the 2 developments, but the similarities are sufficient for me to take note of that extension in assessing these appeals. In particular, in both cases the extension has/would have a limited and proportionate width in comparison to the house.
8. The proposed side extension would be in a prominent position on this corner, extending up to the back of the footway. The proposed double height glazing would form an interesting design feature here, helping to break up the massing of the new gable. The extensions would be well-detailed to reflect the character of the existing house, with contemporary touches, and would not be overly bulky or imposing.

¹ APP/T5720/D/19/3226602

9. The other half of this pair of semis has a front dormer window. The proposed front dormer in Appeal B would be in character and scale with that dormer and others on nearby houses. It would be appropriate in this context.
10. I conclude that both of the appeal proposals would harmonise with the existing building and would not harm the character or appearance of the local area. They accord with the aims of London Plan Policies D3 and D4, Core Planning Strategy Policy CS14 and Sites and Policies Plan 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.
11. The same set of conditions is necessary for both applications. Conditions specifying the relevant plans are needed to provide certainty and conditions requiring the use of materials as proposed are needed to protect local character and appearance. Conditions restricting the use of the roof of the rear extension are also necessary in order to protect neighbours' privacy.
12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both of these appeals should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS: APPEAL A (APP/T5720/D/21/3286540)

- 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: ARC 2002 B-02 Rev A; ARC 2002 B-03 Rev A; ARC 2002 B-04 Rev A; ARC 2002 B-05 Rev A.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall be as specified on the application form and approved plans.
- 4) Access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS: APPEAL B (APP/T5720/D/21/3286541)

- 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: ARC 2002 A-02 Rev A; ARC 2002 A-03 Rev A; ARC 2002 A-04 Rev A; ARC 2002 A-05 Rev A.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall be as specified on the application form and approved plans.
- 4) Access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.