

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14TH June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/24/3337557

58 Pepys Road, Raynes Park, London SW20 8PF

- 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 Ash Vithaldas against the decision of the London Borough of Merton Council.
 - The application Ref 23/P1831, dated 24 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is for conversion of roof from single pitched to mansard.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the "Framework") was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the Appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated within a residential street with a mix of traditional and more contemporary architectural forms including flat roofed blocks of flats.
5. The subject dwelling is a reasonably modern two storey house with a pitched roof running front to rear, the western gable of which is particularly visible in the street scene. The dwelling as a whole is of a simple, but pleasant design and has a neutral impact upon the street scene. Reference has been made by the Council to the impact of the proposal upon the surrounding Lambton Road Conservation Area, although I have been provided with no documentation that demonstrates where its boundary lies.
6. Notwithstanding this, in contrast to the existing architecture of 58 Pepys Road the mansard roof form proposed would constitute an alien feature that would fail to relate to any buildings within the immediate locality and would appear as an incongruous design within the street. Therefore, whilst I note that no58 has a block of flat roof flats next to it, and that there is another similar style block

next to no60 Pepys Road, a collection of mixed size, shape, height and styles of buildings including blocks of flats, Victorian houses, new-build properties and bungalows does not mean that anything should go. I note the example of the house on Pepys Road that has a mansard style roof at the front and whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of this or otherwise, ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS14 of the Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) and Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014) which together seek to deliver good design in order to respect, reinforce and enhance the local character of the area in which it is located; use appropriate architectural forms which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting, whilst also respecting and complementing the design and detailing of the original building along with its form, scale, bulk and proportions whilst conserving the setting of heritage assets.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR