
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2019

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3227167
34 Woodcote Avenue, Wallington SM6 0QY

- 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 Ms Debbie ODonnell and Mr Greg Downer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/00260, dated 13 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2 x two-storey flank extensions and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension to each side of the property, a single-storey rear extension and single-storey front extension, at 34 Woodcote Avenue, Wallington SM6 0QY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2019/00260, dated 13 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 18/214-03 Rev A, 19/015-03, 19/015-04 Revision A and 19/015-05 Revision A.
 - 3) Specifications and samples of all external facing materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before their use on site. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. Despite the description of development set out above, I consider the description found on the decision notice and the appellant's appeal form better reflect the scheme that is before me and that which the Council considered. My findings therefore relate to this description of development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The residential area within which the site is located includes dwellings that are primarily detached and arranged parallel with the surrounding streets. The spacing between the dwellings, their proximity to the street frontage, along with the architectural design and the extent of mature landscaping, vary throughout the area. However, taken together these stated features make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the Woodcote Avenue Area of Special Local Character (the WAASLC), within which the site is located. This is a designated locally as a heritage asset.
5. Whilst there is built form across the majority of the appeal site the existing single storey elements to either side provide a degree of openness to the properties either side. The proposals would significantly alter this relationship by increasing the height of the dwelling to either side.
6. In the context of the guidance within the Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 4, adopted October 2006 (SPD4), the proposed two-storey flank extensions would take an integrated approach but would not be considered subordinate to the dwelling. They would also not comply with the majority of the general rules of thumb referred to in SPD4. The proposed two-storey extensions would either be flush with or forward of the front elevation and would almost double the existing width of the dwelling at first floor level. This would bring greater prominence to the built form of the extended dwelling. Nonetheless, I am mindful that every case must be judged on its own individual merits with all evidence taken together as a whole.
7. I find the architectural detailing of the proposed extensions to be pleasant given that they would incorporate form and detailing consistent with the host dwelling and are broken down into smaller component parts. I also note that the Council does not raise concern in this regard. Furthermore, the eaves levels would be lower at the side and the proposed roof slope would angle away from the site's boundaries. This would not only provide visual interest to the façade but ensure that the resultant built form would not be imposing and would maintain a degree of openness between the properties.
8. Whilst the perception of this spacing would change, the proposed development would not lead to a visual terracing effect and the spacing would not be significantly different to others in the locality. In particular, there are other large properties that occupy the majority of their frontage. The proposed development would not therefore be harmful to the overall rhythm and spacing of built form that informs the character and appearance of the WAASLC.
9. Like the Council, I have no concerns about the proposed single-storey extensions to the front and rear of the dwelling. Both extensions would be designed in a manner appropriate to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Whilst the proposed development would not comply with SPD4, for the reason outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the street scene or the wider character and appearance of the WAASLC. Hence, the proposal's compliance with Policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (2018) would outweigh any conflict with SPD4. This is because these policies seek to ensure that new development respects the local context and responds to the local character and heritage assets of an area. Design should be of a high standard, with a scale, massing and height suitable to the

setting of a site. Elements that contribute to the character and appearance of Areas of Special Local Character should also be conserved and enhanced.

Conditions

11. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the WAASLC, it is necessary to impose a materials condition. I have not included a landscaping condition as this is not required to make the development acceptable given that the site boundaries are already delineated by substantial mature planting.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR