



# Appeal Decisions

Hearing and site visit  
held on 8 July 2009

by **Paul Jackson** B Arch (Hons) RIBA

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

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:**  
**7 August 2009**

---

## **Appeal A: APP/T5720/A/09/2099306** **71 Dora Road, London SW19 7JT**

- 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 Paul Riley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
- The application Ref 07/P3692, dated 28 November 2007, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2008.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling house and erection of a three storey semi detached house comprising 1 x 4 bedroom house and 1 x 3 bedroom house with work space and recreational room.

---

## **Appeal B: APP/T5720/A/09/2098386** **71 Dora Road, London SW19 7JT**

- 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 Paul Riley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Merton.
- The application Ref 08/P0468, dated 14 February 2008, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2008.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling house and erection of a three storey detached house comprising 5 bedrooms with recreational room.

---

### **Preliminary matter**

1. The Council described the development subject of appeal A as 'Erection of a three storey semi-detached building, comprising two houses (one of which includes work space and recreational room) involving demolition of existing dwelling house and relocation of electricity substation.' I regard this to be a more accurate description.
2. At the Hearing, the appellant agreed with a third party that the north point on the drawings was incorrect by 90 degrees; and that references to compass directions in the representations should be read with that in mind. A correct OS map extract was provided by the Council. I have considered the appeals on the basis of the correct compass point.

### **Decisions**

3. For the reasons given below, the appeals are dismissed.

### **Main issues**

4. Following from the reasons for refusal, the main issues in both appeals are as follows:
-

