
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/17/3179517
335 Sutton Common Road, Sutton, SM3 9HZ

- 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 Terry Wilkins, L W Properties Surrey Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref A2016/75321/FUL, dated 5 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to create a 2 bedroomed dwelling involving the removal of the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of development above from the Council's decision notice rather than the planning application, as this more succinctly describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the corner of Sutton Common Road and Ridge Road. Similar residential properties surround the site, though a shopping parade stands opposite and a small commercial unit stands on the opposite corner of Ridge Road. Properties on Sutton Common Road and Ridge Road are staggered but tend to be set back from the highway a similar distance, behind front gardens and parking areas. This creates a spacious and verdant street scene, particularly along Ridge Road which has wide tree lined pavements.
5. The appeal property currently extends slightly beyond the front elevation of buildings on Ridge Road but the side garden allows an open view down the street, adding to the sense of spaciousness and suburban character. The proposed dwelling would extend sideways, close to the boundary and well beyond the staggered building line of properties on Ridge Road. This would significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness on entering Ridge Road and become a prominent visually intrusive addition to the street scene.

6. I note that the building on the opposite corner of Ridge Road, incorporating a retail unit, was granted planning permission by the Council and has been extended up to the boundary with Ridge Road. I do not know the full details of this case or the circumstances under which planning permission was granted. However, the building is only single storey at the point that it meets the public highway and as such, its effects are not comparable to the appeal proposal. This is the same for a number of the examples identified by the appellant and again, full details of these cases are not before me. As such, I have considered the appeal on its own merits.
7. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area for the reasons I have set out. As such, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016); Policies BP12 and PMP2 of the Core Planning Strategy (2009); Policies DM1, DM3 and DM30 of the Site Development Policies Development Plan Document (2012); and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 14: Creating Locally Distinctive Places. Together, these seek high quality design that protects local character and distinctiveness and seeks to resist garden development where this would harm local character.
8. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR