



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/24/3354971

6 Heyford Road, Mitcham, Merton CR4 3EU

- 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 Pavel Ignatov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
 - The application Ref is 24/P1809.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage into habitable room and erection of a part single, part two storey side extension and erection of a single storey rear extension and a second storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the conversion of garage into habitable room and erection of a part single, part two storey side extension and erection of a single storey rear extension and a second storey rear extension at 6 Heyford Road, Mitcham, CR4 3EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/P1809, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing Nos: site location plan, 2425/09.P.001 and 2425/09.P.003.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the first floor rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Located on the north side of Heyford Road, the site is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It has been previously extended to include a hip to gable conversion and flat roofed rear dormer. It also has a single storey half width flat roof rear extension, and a flat roofed single storey attached garage. The proposal is for a first floor rear extension, first floor side extension, and full width single storey rear extension. The site has two approved applications (23/P0623 and 23/P0625) which encompass the majority of the appeal proposal. The Council notably raise no objections to the single storey rear extension, which contains a flat roof, or the first floor side

extension. The proposed first floor rear extension would be located off the rear eastern corner of the original house, appearing central with the addition of the first floor side extension. It would have a flat roof.

5. The buildings along Heyford Road have a distinctive balanced appearance on the front elevations with bay windows and covered porches. Hipped roofs were originally used on the end of terrace rows, however, there are a number of hip to gable extensions, such as the appeal site and the end of the row at No 16. Additionally, within the terrace row, there are a number of flat roofed rear dormers. The rear elevations of dwellings in the terrace exhibit a variety of single storey ground floor extensions, some flat roofed, some sloping, and all of various widths and depths, creating a haphazard and disjointed appearance. Additionally, No 16 has a flat roofed first floor rear extension, approved in 2017, that protrudes from the original rear corner of the dwelling. Given these factors, the rear elevation of the row contains a prevailing character of mixed roof designs, first floor flat roof extension and varying single storey extensions.
6. The proposed first floor rear extension would be very similar in form to that of No 16, with its positioning, depth, and height. To this extent, it would in some way bookend the row and create an element of symmetry. Furthermore, whilst it would be a flat roofed design, which would generally be regarded as inappropriate for a first floor extension, the proposal would be consistent with the prevailing character of the host dwelling and this specific row, notably No 16. The scale, bulk and proportions would respect the original dwelling and row, and the proposal would respond to the distinctive local character in this terrace.
7. Accordingly, in this instance, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would comply with the Merton Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) Policy CS 14 and Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) Policies DM D2 and DM D3, insofar as they seek high quality development that respects and responds to distinctive local character, respects the form and proportions of the original building and relates positively to the rhythm and proportions of the wider setting.

Other matters

8. I am satisfied that the proposal would not lead to an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings, by way of loss of privacy or light.

Conditions

9. The plans are listed for certainty. It would be unnecessary to impose a condition for materials, given approved plans detail the materials would match the existing. It would not be reasonable or necessary to restrict construction or delivery times for extensions to a single dwelling house. Conditions to remove permitted development rights and restrict the use of the flat roof would not meet the tests of necessity or reasonableness, because the proposal would be required to be built in accordance with the approved plans. The sections indicate the floor levels would remain the same as existing and it would be unnecessary to impose additional conditions relating to flood risk.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR