



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2024

**by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/24/3353158**

**5 Arundel Avenue, Morden SM4 4DR**

- 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 and Mrs Martin and Michaela Kacmarova-Madarova against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
  - The application Ref. is 24/P0201.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a part two/part single storey side & single storey rear extension and the erection of a hip to gable rear dormer roof extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part, and the street scene of Arundel Avenue.

### Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is the end property of one of two terraces, each of three dwellings at a corner of Arundel Avenue. The terraces are buildings of an attractive original design and appearance, with their symmetry in particular making a positive contribution to the street scene. However, from the Ordnance Survey based site plan which includes the footprint of the terrace and each dwelling within it, and from observations made on my visit, it is clear that the amount of floorspace in the original house is fairly modest.
4. It is frequently the position that the spatial needs of modern families are not easily reconciled with the constraints of the original dwelling's design and setting, and it would appear that No. 5 Arundel Avenue is a case in point. In such cases it is for the policies and design guides of Local Planning Authorities to manage proposals for alterations and additions in a way that not only meets the reasonable aspirations of applicants for more living space but also avoids harm being caused to the character and appearance of the host building.
5. In this appeal Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Council's Sites and Policies Plan 2014 are cited in the Notice of Refusal as is Policy CS14 of the Merton Core Strategy 2011. Both DM policies have a large number of criteria for development proposals to meet, but I note that the Officer's Report refers in particular to Policy DM D3 as requiring extensions to respect the design,

detailing, form, bulk and proportions of the host building as well as respecting the space between buildings where it contributes to the character of the area.

6. As regards the latter, there is only a narrow gap between the two terraces and it is clear from both the proposed plans and the CGI submitted with the appeal that this would be obstructed at first floor and roof level, especially when seen together with the already approved hip to gable roof extension. I consider that this would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance on this part of the Avenue. I also consider the Council is correct in its observation that the roof of the first-floor side extension would be harmfully contrived and alien to the building's traditional design and character.
7. Furthermore, in terms of my reference in paragraph 4 above to the balance between the appellants' needs and the design merits of the original dwelling, in my view the Council has already been extremely accommodating in interpreting the scale and design of the already built rear extension and a proposed rear dormer almost the same size as the roof plane as being compliant with the adopted policies.
8. Be that as it may, in this appeal it is the cumulative effect of the alterations and additions that must be the deciding factor. And having taken all the points raised into account on behalf of the appellants, I find that the combination of the already approved extensions with the addition of a first-floor side extension would be harmfully prejudicial to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part, and the street scene of Arundel Avenue.
9. As such, the appeal scheme would conflict with the aforementioned development plan policies as well as with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed and Beautiful Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2023.
10. For these reasons the appeal fails.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR