



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2024

by L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/W/24/3338969

26 Ridgway Place, Wimbledon, Merton, London SW19 4EP

- 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 Alex Liu against the decision of London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref is 23/P2721.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling for replacement dwelling including a basement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. This proposal follows a previous appeal decision¹ in April 2024, which dismissed a similar proposal on the appeal site. Given the similarities between the current proposal and the earlier scheme, the previous appeal decision is a material consideration in this case.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 24 Ridgway Place (No 24) with regard to outlook; and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. No 24 is a detached property which lies adjacent to the appeal site. Ridgway Place is on an incline, and due to the sloping topography, the appeal site is in an elevated position in relation to No 24. The local neighbourhood is suburban in character, with large dwellings being situated relatively close together. The existing dwelling at No 26 Ridgway Place (No 26) and the property at No 22 Ridgway Place currently extend beyond the rear elevation of No 24, which gives its rear amenity area a sense of enclosure.
5. The proposed replacement dwelling at No 26 would have a comparable degree of separation from No 24 as existing, but would extend out further to the rear than the existing dwelling. Amendments have been made to the previous application, which would see the wall adjacent to No 24 reduced in depth prior

¹ APP/T5720/W/23/3331881

to being stepped in. However, due to the extended projection of the proposed dwelling, and its greater height, which is exacerbated by the difference in site levels, the proposal would have a dominating and overbearing impact on the outdoor amenity space and sitting out area of No 24.

6. The rear garden of No 24 is a good size, and the proposed development would not lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight. Nonetheless the additional built form would be oppressive and would unacceptably increase the sense of enclosure, particularly to the patio and sitting out area which is directly to the rear of the property. This would be to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of No 24.
7. The appellant has made reference to the height, massing and relationship between other properties in the vicinity. However, the layout and depth of No 24 differs somewhat from surrounding properties, with its rear elevation extending less far into its plot than that of neighbouring dwellings. In this instance, the relationship between other properties is therefore not directly comparable.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 24 with regard to outlook. As such, it would conflict with Policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Map (2014) (MSPP) which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that the living conditions of existing and future occupiers are not unduly diminished.

Character and appearance

9. Ridgway Place predominantly comprises semi-detached and detached dwellings of various architectural styles and periods, with a number of new dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site which assimilate well into the street scene.
10. Due to the topography of Ridgway Place, the height of the buildings respond to the gradient of the hill, stepping down the slope. The proposal has been amended since the previous application and appeal decision, with the ridge height of the proposed dwelling being reduced. The height of the roof and the eaves line would therefore be lower than the stepped down roof of 28 Ridgway Place and would integrate and sit comfortably with the established rhythm and stepped down character of the street scene.
11. No 24 has a garage which projects further to the front than the main elevation of both the existing and the proposed dwelling, and the main elevation of the existing property at No 26 projects forward of the main elevation of No 24 and is visible above No 24's garage. However, the front elevation of the existing property at No 26 has a less solid building line than the proposed dwelling, which helps to reduce its visual impact when viewed along Ridgway Place. A larger element of the front elevation of the replacement dwelling would be visible above the garage of No 24. Notwithstanding the reduction in height of the proposal from the previous scheme, the greater scale and bulk of the proposed dwelling in comparison to the existing property, would result in it appearing as obtrusive, bulky and visually prominent in the street scene, particularly when viewed from further down Ridgway Place.
12. As such, the scale and design of the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy DM D2 of

the MSPP which seeks to ensure that developments relate positively and appropriately to the siting, scale and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns of the surrounding area. It would also conflict with Policy CS14 of the Merton Local Development Framework Core Planning Strategy (2011) which highlights that development needs to be designed in order to respect, reinforce and enhance the local character of the area.

Other Matters

13. The parties engaged with one another at the pre-application stage and the scheme was amended in order to try to address the Council's concerns. Furthermore, following the previous appeal decision at the site, further amendments have been made to the scheme. However, the amendments are not sufficient to overcome the identified harm and the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR