
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3254409

1 Esher Avenue, North Cheam SM3 9AY

- 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 Lavan Mano against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/00084, dated 27 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a part one, part two storey front, side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of development in the banner above which was also quoted by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this adequately and succinctly describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace property fronting Esher Avenue. Within the proximity of the appeal site, the area is characterised by typically terraced and semi-detached dwellings of varying character. Due to the properties end of terrace position, this results in a substantial separation distance between the appeal property and the rear elevation of the dwellings along Henley Avenue. This creates an attractive open aspect along this part of Esher Avenue.
5. The proposal would extend the built form up to the side boundary at first floor level. Given the position of the site and the large separation distance to the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling on Henley Avenue, a two-storey side extension would not unacceptably close the gap between the dwellings and would not harm the open character along this part of Esher Avenue. In addition, the side extension would be set down from the roof of the property and would be recessed at first floor level. This would create an impression of

subservience on the proposed front elevation. In this regard, the front elevation would not appear out of character in the street scene and would be of acceptable design.

6. However, whilst the large separation distance between dwellings would allow for a two-storey side extension, this open aspect leads to the side elevation being a prominent feature when viewed from the immediate street scene and surrounding properties. The proposed rear projection at first floor level would increase the depth of the side elevation beyond the original building line at first floor level creating a large flank wall. Whilst the rear projection would adopt a lower ridge height, nevertheless it would unacceptably increase the scale and massing of this prominent side elevation leading to it appearing overly large and bulky. The side elevation would appear as an imposing feature when viewed from the street scene and from surrounding properties.
7. In respect of the impact of the proposal on the rear elevation, I would agree with the Council that the single storey rear extension would be acceptable. Similarly, I have not found harm with the two-storey side extension. However, the size of the additional first floor rear projection would add further bulk to the rear elevation at first floor level. In combination with the other aspects of the scheme, this would lead to the proposal appearing overly dominant on the rear elevation.
8. Overall, the proposal would be of a scale and bulk that would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would dominate the existing dwelling and would not appear as a sympathetic addition to it. Although there is a varied architectural character in the area, with existing properties having been extended, I did not observe an extension on the scale of that proposed comprising front, side and rear extensions. In any event, taking into consideration the particular circumstances of the site, and surrounding built form, I do not consider the proposal would successfully integrate into the area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and the existing dwelling. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) and the Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 4 (2006). Together, these seek that new development including extensions are attractive, respect local character and are of suitable scale and massing to the setting of the site and townscape, should be in sympathy with and respectful to the existing dwelling and make a positive contribution to the street scene.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the desire of the appellant to provide additional space for his family. Whilst I am sympathetic to these private needs, this does not outweigh the harm the scale of the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area and the dwelling. Given this harm, the proposal does not comply with the development plan. Accordingly, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, the appeal does not succeed.

S Thomas

INSPECTOR