
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/17/3166693
139 St James Road, Sutton SM1 2TJ

- 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 Julio Mosquera against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref B2016/75228/FUL, dated 24 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to enlarge flats 1, 2 and 3 with a rear balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey property which sits within a short terrace of similar properties, within this residential area. The property is sited adjacent to a sharp corner in the road and is the last property on this side, abutting railway land. The property is divided into 3 flats, one being accommodated within the roof-space.
4. The Council's Policy BP12 of the Core Planning Strategy and Policy DM1 of the Site Development Policies DPD aim to ensure that proposals are complementary with or improve the area, amongst other things. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 '*Design of Residential Extensions*' offers more detailed guidance and states that such extensions should be subordinate to the main building and should be set back at the front, have a lower roof and should be no wider than one-third to one-half the width of the existing property.
5. The proposal would be over half the width of the existing building, would have no set-back at the front and would have a roof of the same height as the existing building. The appellant points out that its situation at the end of the road where it abuts the railway means that these considerations are not relevant to this proposal.

6. Whilst I accept that the appeal site is not one where a side extension would be close to a neighbouring building to the side, I consider that the considerations set out in the SPD are relevant in order that an extension will appear subordinate to the main building. As a result of the size and design of the proposal, which takes no account of these considerations, I consider that it would appear unduly dominant and would fail to respect and be subordinate to the existing building. In this way the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character of the area.
7. The proposal would include the provision of rear balconies and a form wherein the extension would appear truncated due to its rear wall rising to the full height of the ridge of the building. These are features that, if visible, would be harmful to the area in my view. However, as they would be hidden due to the shape of the building, the site and the adjacent land use, I attach only limited weight to the unacceptable appearance of these aspects of the development.
8. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representation, but find nothing which outweighs my findings. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR