The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2019

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3238896
94 Longfellow Road, Worcester Park, Sutton KT4 8BE

- 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 Miss Mcshane against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
- The application Ref DM2019/00948, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2019.
- The development proposed is a rear conservatory.

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 property and the wider area.

Reasons

3. 94 Longfellow Road is a modest mid terrace property which, like many of the nearby properties, has previously been extended at ground floor level into the narrow gardens which slope gently upwards and which are characteristic of these houses. The current flat roofed extension, which spans the whole width of the garden, is around 5 m in depth.

4. The extension of the property by another 3 metres would further elongate the ground floor element of the house. The cumulative length of the ground floor rear extensions would be around 8 metres from the rear elevation of the two storey original property. At its highest point the glass and white upvc roof would be around 3.3 metres in height. Irrespective of the materials used, when viewed in the context of a modest terraced property, notwithstanding the length of the garden, the depth of the extension would appear incongruous and would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the house.

5. Similarly, albeit, my site visit took place in late autumn, when it would be expected that plants in the gardens would be less verdant, it was clear that the gardens have a relatively open aspect. Therefore, the proposed ground floor extension would not only have an adverse impact on the host property but would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the wider character of the area when viewed from the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties.

6. In coming to my conclusion, I have been aware of the four examples of planning permissions which have been granted for ground floor rear extensions at Longfellow Road, to which my attention has been drawn. However, I am not familiar with the details of the individual cases, including the policy context in which any of these decisions were made. Moreover, I have made my decision on the basis of the individual merits of the application before me.

7. Therefore, in sum, the proposed development would not be sympathetic to the character or appearance of the host property and wider area and would be contrary to the policy objectives of policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan and the design guidelines contained within the Supplementary Planning Document SPD 4 Design of Residential Extensions 2006.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above I consider that the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR