



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3233000
37 Clifton Road, Wallington SM6 8AL

- 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 Peter Larsen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/00461, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above existing single storey extension with internal alterations and the addition of a rooflight to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by a fuller version on the appeal form. I consider that subsequent description to be usefully more comprehensive and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an attractive building which is part of a well preserved group of Victorian houses of varying styles. The group value of these buildings contributes to their inclusion in the locally listed buildings of the Borough. The site is also part of an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC) which has a rich variety of architectural styles including examples of good quality Edwardian and Victorian Architecture.
5. The host building is of an asymmetrical design with an unorthodox roofscape which contributes to the character and appearance of the building and its importance as a heritage asset. The front elevation is of a handsome appearance which is emphasised by the use of white render, compared to the more understated character of the predominantly brick side elevation and ground floor extension. Although the proposed first floor extension would be

set back from the front elevation, I saw that it would be readily visible from the highway to the front of the site.

6. The roof of the proposed extension would project above the eaves of the roof of the host building and would detract from the distinctive roof form of the dwelling. The proposed use of a hipped roof set below the ridge of the main roof of this part of the dwelling would not mitigate the obtrusive projection above the eaves, even within such a varied roofscape. The extension would also substantially obscure views of a chimney further to the rear which, in combination with other chimneys, contributes to the character of the building. Furthermore, the use of white render for the proposal would also increase its prominence, to the detriment of the importance of the front elevation. These matters would lead to substantial harm to the character and appearance of this locally listed building and the contribution that it makes to the streetscape.
7. The appellant has referred to the potential for an unsympathetic side dormer extension which could be erected under the property's permitted development rights. However, I have no substantive evidence to indicate that such an extension would be constructed should this appeal be dismissed, and I therefore give this limited weight as a fallback scheme in my consideration of this appeal.
8. I acknowledge that the appeal site is not designated as a Listed Building or within a Conservation Area, and that the Council has not withdrawn permitted development rights. However, these matters do not lead me to a different conclusion with regards to the harm arising from the proposal or the importance of the site as a heritage asset.
9. I am mindful of the benefits of the proposal with regard to improvements to the bathroom accommodation of the dwelling, but this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape, with subsequent harm to this locally listed building and the ASLC. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 which seek to ensure that new development is designed to the highest standard especially with regard to architectural detailing, responds to local character and heritage assets where development would be expected to conserve, and where practicable enhance, the historic environment.
11. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR