



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2022

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 OCTOBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/22/3290200

Flat 9, 119 Arthur Road, Wimbledon, London, SW19 7DR

- 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 Roger Kilby, Fleetwood Developments Limited, against the decision of London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 21/P3609, dated 7 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as construction of a mansard roof over new extension only with 2No dormer windows and 1No Velux window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locally listed building.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large, locally listed building which has been converted into flats and is constructed using red brick at ground floor level and pebbledash at the upper floors. Its most notable features are the octagonal corner tower and its well detailed porch. Stemming from its coherent design and architectural qualities, its significance is, amongst other aspects, due to the positive contribution it makes to the quality of the built environment in the locality. Neighbouring the appeal property is a three storey building which, whilst constructed more recently, is built in a style which loosely echoes the appeal building. The two buildings share a large front driveway and rear communal garden area.
4. Extending from the rear elevation is a single storey projection with a hipped roof which accommodates a two-bedroom flat. The appeal proposal would enlarge this flat through the introduction of a second storey of accommodation within an enlarged and altered roof. I note that the chosen design, which would retain the pitch of the existing roof closest to the host building's main elevation whilst incorporating a mansard style roof form towards the rear, is intended to reduce the overall bulk of the development. However, I do not find this design approach successful. The mixing of the two dissimilar roof forms together within the same rear projection would represent an uncharacteristic development. As a result of its form and bulk towards the rear of the projection, it would also appear ungainly and awkward. Whilst the increase in

roof volume may be modest, this does not overcome the harm arising as a result of the discordant roof forms.

5. The mansard style roof form would be located to the rear of the projection and would result in a reduction in volume when compared to the previously dismissed appeal scheme (APP/T5720/W/21/3273171). However, the visual juxtaposition of roof forms, particularly at the junction where they meet, would accentuate its awkward design. The existing host building does already have a variety of roof forms. However, there are no examples of two roof forms joining together within one part of the roofscape in a similar manner as proposed. Similarly, whilst there is a mansard style roof form and various other roof types and features at the adjoining property, which shares loose architectural similarities with the appeal property, it is the proposed introduction of dual roof forms on the same projection which would appear particularly incongruous. The set back of the proposed mansard and the development being finished in matching materials do not lead me to a different conclusion.
6. The development would not be overly prominent from the public domain. However, during my site visit I observed that a portion of the existing projection's roof is visible when viewed from Arthur Road. Consequently, the appeal development, which would be more bulky and project further to the rear, would be visible in public views. The projection would also be visible from a number of residential windows within the appeal building and the neighbouring building. It would also be visible to all users of the communal garden which is shared between the properties. Overall, I find that the dormer would be a discordant addition to the roofslope which would cause significant harm to the host property.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the locally listed building. I therefore find that it conflicts with Policy CS14 of the Merton Local Development Framework Core Planning Strategy (2011), Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (2014) and Policy D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021). Amongst other aspects and with regard to extensions in particular, these policies seek to ensure that the historic environment is safeguarded from harm, and that new development is of a high standard of design and respects local character.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) considers non-designated heritage assets at paragraph 203 and indicates that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Although the improved and enlarged living space that the scheme would provide would essentially equate to a private benefit given the nature of the appeal proposal, it has been put to me that the scheme would provide an improved and quantitative contribution to the housing shortfall in the district. However, based on the scale and nature of the development and that the scheme would improve and expand the existing flat rather than provide a new separate unit of accommodation, the benefits would be limited. Taking into account the building's significance and the harm I have identified, the benefits do not outweigh the harm the proposal would have on the appearance and significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The

proposed development therefore conflicts with the provisions of the Framework in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matters

9. Although the site is within the Wimbledon North Conservation Area, the Council has not addressed the effect of the appeal proposal on the designated heritage asset. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I am not pursuing this matter further because it could not lead me to a different decision.
10. Although not referred to in the reason for refusal, in its Statement of Case the Council has raised concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on neighbouring occupiers' living conditions. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons there is no need for me to consider this matter further as it would not alter the outcome of the appeal.
11. The appellant highlights that there was only one objection to the planning application and suggests that the development would not impinge on the living conditions of others. However, this neutral consideration is outweighed by the harm identified above. The development would provide additional accommodation within an existing unit and would thus improve the living conditions of the occupiers whilst also making a contribution to the existing housing stock in the area. The development would also make better use of the property. Be that as it may, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above or the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the locally listed building. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR