
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/22/3313808
105 Dorset Road, Merton, London SW19 3HE

- 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 Grigoratis/Chioni against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 22/P1934, dated 22 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension over existing side extension at first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension over existing side extension at first floor at 105 Dorset Road, Merton, London SW19 3HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/P1934, dated 22 June 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, ARC 2202 PA-02 A (Proposed Ground Floor and First Floor Plans), ARC 2202 PA-03 A (Proposed Second Floor and Roof Plans), ARC 2202 PA-04 A (Proposed Second Floor and Roof Plans), ARC 2202 PA-05 A (Proposed Elevations).
 - 3) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 8:00am and 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays, 8:00am to 1:00pm on Saturdays and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
 - 4) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this semi-detached house which sits adjacent to the junction of Dorset Road, Erridge Road and Sandbourne Avenue. The house has been extended in the past, including with a 2 storey side extension and a rear dormer window. The property has a hipped roof at the side. Its location means that views of the side and rear are clear from some positions within the surrounding roads.
4. The surrounding residential area contains much variety in the style and design of houses. Very many of these have been extended and include roof extensions to form gables in place of the original hipped roofs. A number also include large rear dormer windows. The appellant also points to a number of examples where gabled roofs have been formed over side extensions, rather than over the original house.
5. The proposed extensions would mean that the side gable would be set close to the flank boundary of the property and would be prominent within the street-scene. The proposed rear dormer window would extend over the proposed new roof and would be appreciably wider than the existing rear dormer. Due to the position of the house, this would be visible from public vantage points and from within private gardens and properties.
6. From the information submitted with the appeal and from my own visit to the area, I can see that the area contains numerous examples of extensions wherein the original hipped roof has been replaced with a gabled roof, sometimes adding considerable bulk to the roof of the properties, including some examples on Dorset Road. The appellant has included examples where approvals have been given for gabled roofs over a side extension, along with a dormer window in the rear of the roof. From these and my observations, it is the case that rear dormer windows, some large and prominent, are well established features of the locality.
7. The proposal would include windows within the proposed side wall which would also be set away from the boundary for some of its length, due to the angled nature of the site boundary. The ground floor wall would follow the boundary and the small section of tiled roof, along with the windows would help to break up the mass and provide domestic detailing to the side wall. The rear dormer would also contain windows reflecting the alignment of windows at the first floor. Its size and impact would be little different to others that I saw in the area, including those at Nos 299 and 391 Cannon Hill Lane. Other examples of large rear dormers exist in the locality and are referred to by the appellants in their submissions.
8. Within the context that I observed, I consider that the proposal reflects a form of development that has been accepted and is established in the area. Therefore, I find its form and scale is appropriate and does not raise any conflict with Policies DM2 of the London Plan, DM D2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and CS14 of the Core Strategy.
9. In relation to conditions, as well as the standard condition for commencement I shall include conditions which identify the approved plans and which also control the use of the external materials. Taking account of the proximity of neighbours, I shall also include a condition which controls the hours of construction works.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR