



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2023

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/23/3328546

23 Russell Road, Mitcham CR4 3AP

- 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 Penelope Flahive against the decision of London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref 23/P1112, dated 25 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposal from the planning application. However, I have deleted superfluous references to 'Householder planning application' and the site address as they are not a description of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Russell Road is mainly characterised by blocks of two-storey terraced dwellings. No 23 is an end terrace unit. It forms part of a wider terrace which has a consistent ridgeline with hipped ends. Individual dwellings within the terrace are of comparable width and incorporate regularly spaced two-storey bay windows with one of the more central units having a gabled, square bay. Similar facing materials and tiled porch canopies are also repeated across the terrace adding to its well-balanced appearance. Due to the position of No 23 close to a bend in the road, its splayed plot provides a pleasant spaciousness between this dwelling and the alternatively angled neighbouring end terrace at No 21. Overall, these factors positively contribute to the order and consistency of the street scene.
5. Even though the front elevation of the extension would be set back from the principal elevation of No 23, its considerable width would compete with the proportions of the host dwelling. Its ridgeline would step down in two stages and would be at odds with the simple roof profile of the dwelling and the wider terrace. The first-floor glazed gable would have a contemporary aesthetic which would not reflect the traditional detailing of No 23 or its neighbours. The scale of the extension would also appear congested between the planned layout of

the terraced blocks due to its close proximity to the alternatively angled dwelling at No 21. The use of matching materials would not be sufficient to assimilate the proposal into its surroundings.

6. The appellant has provided examples of design guidance applied by other Local Planning Authorities all of which depict side extensions with narrower widths, simpler roof profiles and characteristic window detailing relative to their hosts. Therefore, I do not find those examples comparable to the appeal proposal or the site-specific considerations in the case before me.
7. I conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with the high quality design, character and local context requirements of Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS 14 (Design) of the London Borough of Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and Policies DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments) & DM D3 (Alterations and extensions to existing buildings) of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)

Other Matter

8. The appellant suggests that the proposal would allow for the flexibility to accommodate a fourth bedroom on the ground floor to potentially support an elderly and/or disabled member of the household. Whether or not that be the case there is no detailed information to suggest this is a current necessity and I find that the harm identified under the main issue is of overriding concern.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR