



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/24/3358217

150 Streatham Road, Mitcham, Merton CR4 2AE

- 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 Firoz Rajwani against the decision of the London Borough of Merton Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/P3038.
 - The development proposed is for the retention of an outbuilding at rear at 3 metres in height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of an outbuilding at rear at 3 metres in height at 150 Streatham Road, Mitcham, Merton CR4 2AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/P3038, and the plans submitted with it, 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 the following approved plan: 2108_P10 Rev C
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey palisaded mid-terrace house with a relatively small rear garden, and It has been the subject of extensive rear single storey extensions, including extensions that sit to the side and rear of the garden, constructed without the benefit of a planning permission. A previous planning permission¹ has been given for the reduction in height of the existing flat roofed extension at the rear of the garden from approximately 3 metres to 2.5 metres and

¹ Planning Ref:

its retention as a detached outbuilding, which also includes the removal of the existing link extension that sits to one side of the garden.

4. The appeal proposal also includes the removal of the existing link extension to the side of the garden, but the retention of the existing rear most extension as a detached outbuilding would involve no change to its existing height. This would leave the central part of the rear garden open to its full width between an existing extension at the rear of the appeal dwelling and the proposed detached outbuilding at the rear of the garden.
5. The retained flat roofed extension would be the full width of the garden and would sit within a continuous run of similarly scaled outbuildings in the rear of gardens of the majority of other properties in the terrace, including in the rear gardens of the two adjoining houses. The height of the flat roof of the extension to be retained would match the height of the ridge of a neighbouring pitched roof rear outbuilding and would reflect the flat roofs of others in the run of such detached outbuildings.
6. Although the retained rear extension would have a flat roof at 3 metres in height rather than a pitched roof of the same height, its scale, bulk and massing would not result in it dominating the appearance of the appeal dwelling. Rather, it would appear as an outbuilding that would accord with the run of existing outbuildings at the rear of gardens of the houses in the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part.

Living Conditions

7. The height of the proposed detached outbuilding would be the same as some of the existing rear outbuildings to houses in the terrace, including the outbuilding in the rear garden of 152 Streatham Road. Although the retention of the existing flat roof of the proposal would mean that its height would be 3 metres across its full width, its size, scale, bulk and massing would be similar to that of the existing outbuildings at the rear of gardens of the houses in the terrace.
8. As such, the proposal would not present itself as visually intrusive, dominating or overbearing presence, to the extent that it would be experienced by the neighbouring occupiers of 148 and 152 Streatham Road as oppressive. The proposal would not, therefore, result in any significant detrimental effect on the outlook of neighbouring residential occupiers.
9. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. This would accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021 Policies CS 14 of the London Borough of Merton Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the Sites and Policies Plan part of the Merton Local Plan (2014). Collectively these seek development of high quality that responds to the character of a place and to the siting, height and proportions of surrounding buildings, are not unduly dominant, protecting neighbours from visual intrusion and provide quality living conditions for neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council should I be minded to allow the appeal. I find that the suggested condition relating to the restriction of potential use as a roof terrace of the flat roof of the extension retained as an

outbuilding would not be directly related to the proposal. Such a conditions would therefore be unnecessary and would not meet the test for conditions set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

11. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions in the interest of design quality that require compliance with an approved plan and matching materials.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR