
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by **L Regan**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/25/3363589

111 Brangwyn Crescent, Colliers Wood, Merton, London SW19 2UA

- 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 Rehan Nela against the decision of London Borough of Merton.
 - The application ref is 25/P0098.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey upward extension, first and loft floor side window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The local area is predominantly residential in character and comprising a mix of two and three storey residential buildings. The appeal site forms the end unit in a block of back-to-back terraced residential units. The adjoining terrace residential units along the side of the residential unit are all two storeys, however the front building line of the appeal property is set forward, resulting in a different roofline to the adjoining properties and is more visually prominent.
4. The increase in height of the appeal property would not enhance local context or positively respond to local distinctiveness and would be inappropriate in terms of scale, bulk and proportion. This would result in harm to the character and appearance of the streetscape.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to a nearby property at 58 Hogarth Crescent which they consider to be similar and has been extended to provide a second-floor level. In that instance, the extension formed a logical extension to adjoining existing second-floor development and does not result in the same visual harm. Therefore, I do not consider that to justify the appeal proposals.
6. Furthermore, I note that property 109 opposite has a certificate of lawfulness for a front dormer at second floor level. However, that is a single example in a different setting where it adjoins a dwelling with a second floor. That nearby example also does not justify the harmful additional development proposed.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy D3 in the London Plan

(adopted 2 March 2021) and Policies D12.1, D12.2, D12.3 and D12.4 in the Merton Local Plan (adopted 20 November 2024). These policies seek to ensure that appropriately designed development (including building alterations and extensions) which relates appropriately to the street scene and character of the local area is achieved.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to the planning officer's report conclusion that the additional bedroom would increase occupancy levels above that which the communal areas were designed to accommodate. However, I note that this was not a reason for refusal and the planning authority has not signposted any associated policy conflict. I have not attached any weight to this matter in reaching my decision which is based upon harm to the character and appearance.
9. The point has also been made that the dwellings in the local area have outlived usefulness in the present form and needs of residents must be met by extensions such as the appeal proposals. However, the needs of certain residents do not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the local area. It is also must be the case that the dwellings could meet the needs of alternative occupiers without introducing such harm.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

L Regan

INSPECTOR