



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2024

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/23/3328796

Ridgway Dental Practice, 71 Ridgway, London SW19 4SS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Cheetham of Ridgeway Dental Surgery against the decision of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref is 23/P0709.
 - The development proposed is rear second floor flat roof brick extension above the existing outrigger to accommodate an additional dental surgery room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It was requested that I view the appeal site from 69A Ridgway, but I was unable to gain access on my visit. Nevertheless, I was able to view the appeal site and its relationship with neighbouring properties from within the site and the public realm sufficiently in order to reach a decision on this appeal.
3. Various spellings and phrasings of the appellant's details and the appeal site location have been provided. The details in the heading above have been taken from the Appeal Form as I consider that these reflect the circumstances of the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, with due regard to the Wimbledon West Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is part of a terrace containing commercial uses on the ground floor with a mixture of uses, including dwellings, on the upper floors. The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the site in an area which includes a mixture of roof designs, including a flat roofed offshoot on a property adjacent to Denmark Road and the flank wall of a taller building.
6. The rear roofslope of the appeal site is apparent from Denmark Road and appears to be of a traditional design. Although the roofslope is an understated feature, it makes a positive contribution to the character of the building even allowing for the limited extent of visibility from the public realm.
7. The proposed flat roofed extension projecting almost to the ridge of the roof would result in the loss of much of the traditional roof form to the rear of the

building. Due to its scale and design, the proposal would appear as a clumsy and overdominant addition to the rear of the site. The appellant emphasises the flat roof on an offshoot to a nearby property, but this broadly respects the eaves line of the host property and is not of the height and scale of the appeal proposal. Even given the varying design and scale of buildings in the immediate vicinity and the limited extent of visibility of the appeal site, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building.

8. The appeal site is within the Wimbledon West Conservation Area (CA). Based on what I have seen and read the CA is basically urban in character and derives its interest as a designated heritage asset from the quality of its buildings which are reflective of the historical development of the area. Although the existing rear roofscape of the appeal site is of an understated appearance, it is a traditional feature and makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA. The jarring and incongruous scale and design of the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the CA, although the harm to the CA as a whole would be limited given the restricted visibility of the proposal. Nevertheless, I attach great weight to the conservation of the CA as a designated heritage asset in accordance with paragraph 205 of the Framework.
9. The harm to the CA would be less than substantial, and the Framework sets out that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I am mindful of the benefits of the proposal, including the provision of a further surgery for the dental practice. The development plan and the Framework also support the provision of community services. Given the constraints of the existing accommodation and the need for dental services, the provision of an additional surgery carries moderate weight in favour of the proposal. However, this would not outweigh the great weight I have attached to the conservation of the CA.
10. Drawing the above together, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the CA, and there are no public or other benefits that would outweigh that harm. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 which together seek to achieve high quality design and conserve heritage assets. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places as well as conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR