
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/22/3293475

3 Erridge Road, Merton Park, London SW19 3JA

- 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 Dalton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 21/P3418, dated 22 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2021.
 - The proposed development is a double storey side extension with a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development having regard to the character of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey house on Erridge Road, near the junction with Dorset Road. The local area consists predominantly of residential properties.
4. There are two main elements to the appeal scheme. It would be evident from Erridge Road that the ridge height of the two-storey side element would continue the ridge line of the existing property and the front elevation would be flush with the host dwelling.
5. Being flush with the front elevation and the ridge line, the addition would lack subservience. The imposing appearance of the extension would be in contrast to the existing dwelling, and compete with its overall scale. It would represent a bulky addition to the detriment of the character of the building.
6. At the rear, the large, unbroken dormer window would dominate the roof of the property. It would be clearly visible from the private amenity spaces of surrounding dwellings, having an intrusive effect by virtue of its scale and extent across the roof of the building.
7. I am aware that the site is not located in a conservation area with no impact on designated heritage assets, and no important local views or panoramas would be obscured. Moreover, I acknowledge that the scheme would be constructed using complementary materials, results in improvements to the layout of the dwelling to meet living requirements assisting in the provision of care for the

elderly, and there have been no objections from local residents. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

8. I appreciate that alterations to semi-detached properties will inevitably result in an imbalance to an original pair, and with this in mind the principle of extending the property is likely to be acceptable. However, the specific development before me would result in a discordant scheme due to its scale and design as reasoned above.
9. I also recognise the presence of other extensions in the vicinity, and have seen the photographs of existing development in the grounds of appeal. Nevertheless additions to other houses would be neutral considerations in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
10. I conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy CS 14 of the London Borough of Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy July 2011, Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021. Taken together these seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conclusion

11. Based on the above and having regard to all issues raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR