
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/17/3166660

5 Fairlight Close, Worcester Park KT4 8XQ

- 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 Dhannan Chellappah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref A2016/75217/HHA, dated 23 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment¹ with the appeal to seek to address the Council's second reason for refusal. Because the Council would not have had the opportunity to comment under the Householder appeals procedures, this issue may have caused me to review the procedure and seek further comments from the Council. However as I have dismissed the appeal for other reasons this has not been necessary. Even if I had found the effects on the two Poplar trees to be acceptable it would not have changed the outcome of the appeal and consequently, consulting the Council would have unduly delayed my decision with no particular benefit to the appellant.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached residential property located within a residential close that contains a variety of styles and sizes of dwellings. It has a large side garden area that adjoins the rear back gardens of properties on Oaks Avenue which contained mature trees and soft landscaping. The gardens were free from significant development, other than garden sheds and rear extensions to the properties. The side garden area is visible at the head of the close and along with the neighbouring gardens, provides a sense of spaciousness and views of mature trees and landscaping along its side

¹ Landmark Trees dated 29 November 2016.

boundary that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The use of sympathetic materials and bay windows would reflect the appearance of the host property. However, it would result in a significant continuation of the mass and width of the existing house by extending built form across the majority of the width of the side garden, with the flank wall very close to the side boundary and only marginally set back from the front elevation.
6. In combination with its height, form and scale the proposal would substantially change the appearance of the host property when viewed from the street and would be noticeably out of keeping and discordant with the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the properties within the close and the area. In its context it would be an unduly dominant and overly prominent addition that would represent a disproportionate addition to the host property.
7. Furthermore, its overall scale and width would diminish the space between the dwelling and the side boundary to such an extent that it would partially block views of the existing mature trees and soft landscaping. This would be to the detriment of the contribution that the space and such views make to the character and appearance of the area. Overall and in its context it would not represent a high quality of design.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies BP12 of the London Borough of Sutton Core Planning Strategy 2009 and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the London Borough of Sutton Site Development Policies Development Plan Document 2012 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 'Design of Residential Extensions' 2006. When read as a whole, these policies and guidance require development to maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area, be of a scale, massing and height that are appropriate to the setting of the site and be of a high quality of design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan and having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR