
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2017

by **B Bowker Mplan MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 31 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/16/3158386
21A Prince of Wales Road, Sutton SM1 3PE

- 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 Miss Sandra Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref C2016/74722/HHA, dated 21 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as '*retrospective planning permission for alterations to ground floor flat and expansion of first floor flat from a studio flat to a 2 bedroom flat via a loft extension*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. In the Planning Officer's Report, the Council state that they have no concern regarding the effect of the rear ground floor single storey extension and front roof light on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Based on all I have seen and read, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's stance on these aspects of the appeal. Consequently, my assessment below focuses on the proposed second floor extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace two storey property surrounded predominantly by terraced residential use. Prior to the construction of the proposal, the appeal dwelling had a two storey projecting gable to its rear.
 5. During my site visit I saw that the scale of the second floor extension is considerably larger than the two storey rear gable it has replaced. In addition, the height of the proposal matches the ridge height of the host building. I also saw that owing to its second floor height and roof shape, the proposal has a stark appearance in the context of the existing building. Consequently, the scale, siting and design of the proposal have resulted in a visually intrusive
-

form of development that does not respect the character and appearance of the host building.

6. During my site visit I saw extensions and roof alterations at surrounding properties. However, unlike the proposal, they were set back from the eaves and ridgeline of the host building and thus retained a subordinate and complementary appearance. In comparison, the proposal's scale, design and siting have made it a prominent feature that would be noticeable when viewed from neighbouring gardens.
7. Reference is made to the different design of the dwelling in the context of surrounding properties. However, apart from its two storey rear gable, I do not consider the appearance of the dwelling to be markedly different to surrounding properties. Moreover, the previous two storey rear gable does not justify or remove the harm identified above. Similarly, the absence of objections from neighbours has not prevented the resultant harm identified above.
8. Therefore I conclude that the proposal has a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently the proposal is contrary to saved Policy DM1 of the Site Development Policies Document and saved Policy PMP2 of the Core Planning Strategy Document. Combined, these policies seek to ensure development is of a scale massing and height that is appropriate to the site and maintains the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. I have not been provided with copies of Supplementary Planning Document 4 and Sutton's Urban Design Guide as referred to in the Council's decision notice. However, as no specific references are made to these documents, the policies noted above are of most relevance to this matter.

Other matters

10. I have not been provided with full details of the previously approved application (Council Ref C2014/69852/FUL) referred to in the decision notice. Consequently, my assessment as above has been based on the evidence before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR