



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3230824

4 Elm Way, Worcester Park, KT4 8LT

- 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 & Mrs Gopaul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/00653, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and garage and replacement with new single storey rear and two storey side extension. Extended front porch, replacement windows, replacement roof tiles all to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, occupying a prominent position at the end of the linear arrangement of development along Elm Way. Although there is an existing single storey garage and outbuilding to the side of the dwelling, the site has an open and spacious character.
4. The positioning of the adjacent dwelling, No 2, emphasises this further as, in responding to its corner location, it is at an angle to the appeal site. This opens up views to, and an appreciation of the separation between the dwellings, that is afforded by the existing gap at the appeal site. This gap provides a pleasant visual break within the built form along Elm Way and within the wider surrounding area.
5. The appeal scheme proposes a substantial two-storey extension to the side of the existing property. Due to its width and roof arrangement the extension would appear bulky and not as subordinate to the original dwelling.
6. It is acknowledged that the appeal scheme would adhere to certain aspects of the Council's Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, 2006 (SPD4) and aims to follow the integrated approach to extensions. However, as stated within SPD4, whilst this approach can work well in some instances it can also disrupt space between buildings. This is evident in

a number of the examples of nearby extensions that the appellant has provided. This would also be the case at the appeal site were the proposed development to proceed.

7. Whilst there can be flexibility in the application of the SPD criteria, the appeal scheme would fail to achieve a number of the guiding design principles. It would have a width in excess of half that of the original dwelling, include no setback from the front elevation and no lower ridge to the main section of the roof.
8. Consequently, it would dominate the existing building and would result in a bulky addition in close proximity to the site boundary. Considering the staggered arrangement between Nos 2 and 4 the proposal may not result in a direct terracing effect, but it would visually enclose an important gap in the streetscene, and the overall bulk and width of the extension would be particularly discordant.
9. The proposed development would, therefore, have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, in that regard, it would be contrary to Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 which seeks to ensure that development responds to local character and is of a suitable scale, massing and height and makes a positive contribution to the street frontage, as supported by SPD4. The proposals would also fail to achieve the high-quality design requirements of the Council's Urban Design Guide: Creating Local Distinctive Places SPD 14, 2008 or Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. The proposed extension would use materials to match the existing dwelling and a section of the roof would have a lower ridge line. I also note that the Council have raised no concerns in relation to privacy and overlooking, outlook and overshadowing. However, these aspects of the proposal would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. The appellant has also drawn my attention to other extensions in the vicinity of the site and I saw on my site visit that there is a wide variety of house styles and designs in the surrounding area, many of which have been extended in differing styles.
12. Whilst I have considered the detail submitted there are none which appear to be directly comparable to the appeal site when considering siting, design or prominence within the streetscene. Furthermore, I do not know the full circumstances of those schemes, and in any event each case must be considered on its own merits. These other matters do not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR