



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2014

by **R J Maile BSc FRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 August 2014

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/T5720/D/14/2218799**

### **87 Cottenham Park Road, London, SW20 0DR.**

- 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 Jamie Macdonald against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
  - The application, ref: 14/P0387, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2014.
  - The development proposed is rear two storey extension and first floor extension to side at front of house. Conversion of garage to summer house annexe with storage. Change of materials to roof cladding, mansard and windows.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue here is the impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. 87 Cottenham Park Road is a detached Dutch-style house with mansard roof, being located within a mixed residential area. The adjacent properties to either side comprise semi-detached traditional brick and tile or slate houses. There are modern houses opposite and more contemporary dwellings at nos. 26, 26a, 26b and 30a.
  4. I see no objection to the principle of modern changes to individual properties, or to the erection of modern buildings within established residential areas as in the case of those nearby in Cottenham Park Road.
  5. Notwithstanding these comments, the scheme before me seeks to incorporate a flat roofed extension to the rear of the dwelling with stainless steel cladding panels to the first floor, in contrast to the mansard roof cladding of tiles to the host building. This element of the scheme would project above the proposed ground floor extension, providing a visually prominent addition which would be at odds with and unsympathetic to the design and materials of the original building.
-

6. Similarly, the projection of the summer house mezzanine floor incorporates zinc cladding panels that would be visible from adjacent gardens and appear as an alien feature.
7. The proposals also include a first floor extension to the front of no. 87. Whilst I see no objection to this element of the scheme, which will make more effective use of the first floor accommodation, the use of dark grey slates and GRP fascia in place of the existing tile hanging and scalloped timber barge boarding would be out of keeping with the host building and the houses on either side.
8. National policy in the Framework<sup>1</sup> requires Local Planning Authorities to avoid unnecessary prescription in terms of design issues and planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes (paragraphs 59 and 60). Paragraph 58 requires that developments should respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.
9. Whilst taking these factors into account, I have concluded that in this instance the combination of a modern design and use of materials whilst retaining the original structure does not create a visually attractive entity.
10. I therefore find on the main issue that development as proposed would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, contrary to "saved" Policies BE15 (iii) and BE23 (i), (ii), (iii) and (v) of the UDP<sup>2</sup>.

#### **Other Matters**

11. In my consideration of this appeal I have noted the comments of the Council's Case Officer and the contents of his draft report, which recommended that the application be permitted subject to conditions. However, my decision takes into account the observations made during my site visit, the contents of the Planning Officer's report as corrected and the comments of nearby residents and the Residents' Association of West Wimbledon.

#### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R. J. Maile*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> The National Planning Policy Framework.

<sup>2</sup> The London Borough of Merton Unitary Development Plan: October 2003.