



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/25/3366326

80 Lyndhurst Avenue, Streatham, London, SW16 4UF

- 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 Mr Jan Cook against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Reference is 25/P0667.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front dormer extension, a hip to gable, rear dormer and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal property has a Lawful Development Certificate (ref: 25/P0119) for the erection of a hip to gable, rear dormer and front rooflights. I see this as sound fall-back. Therefore, effectively, this appeal is specifically concerned with the addition of a front dormer extension, a slightly larger rear dormer and the cumulative impact of all proposed roof alterations.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey home. The area is of established suburban residential character, and the appeal property and its neighbouring dwellings add positively to this and the pleasing appearance of the locality. The proposal is as described above.
 5. The planned front dormer, with its box-like form, large scale and proximity of position to ridge height, would lead to what I would deem as radical change to and expansion of the roof form. Unfortunately, this front dormer would be patently at odds architecturally and out of scale with the structure below. It would also appear negatively, as markedly at variance from the terraced dwellings alongside and nearby. Overall, the ungainly front dormer and the increased scale of dwelling as whole at upper level would look 'top-heavy' and alien in the street and be jarring on the eye. Regrettably, it would stand out as a poorly designed frontage in a road which deserves better.
-

6. Policies D12.1, D12.3 and D12.4 of Merton Local Plan 2024 and Policy D4 of the London Plan are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek well-designed development of a suitable appearance, scale, form and character to respect local context. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies.
7. For the record, and in line with the Council's reasoning, I do not have an issue with the hip to gable or the specific rear dormer proposals in their own right.

Other matters

8. I do understand the wish to increase space within the home. I can see that consideration has been given to the selection of materials, I note that no neighbours objected, and I appreciate that this is not a Conservation Area. Views of the property are limited but nevertheless I deem it important to protect the aesthetic qualities of this streetscene.
9. I noted a number of other works drawn to my attention. However, through positioning, form, scale, parade format, or planning policies applicable historically, I found none in sum to be comparable to the case before me, which I must, in any event, assess on its own merits. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that a number of the schemes should be used as a benchmark for good design. I am not convinced that front dormers represent the evolving character as put by the Appellant, nor that they should be. Neither am I convinced that because this is an end terrace it should have more roof frontage leeway than the rest of the terrace; consistent roofscapes remain important to my mind.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant, but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character or appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR