
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3261414

43 Sunkist Way, Apeldoorn Drive, Wallington, Surrey, SM6 9LQ

- 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 Marj Drewelus against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/00741, dated 25 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the re-alignment of part of a private footpath and the construction of a single storey side extension consisting of one bedroom and an ensuite bathroom/WC.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by a ground floor maisonette dwelling within a two-storey end of terrace building. The property is located within a residential cul-de-sac largely made up of other terraces and semi-detached properties. To the side of the dwelling is a footpath and a small open grassed area adjacent to a communal car park, which provides a spaciousness that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed development is a single storey extension to the side of the building to provide additional habitable accommodation for the ground floor maisonette, with the re-routing of the footpath around this extension. Due to its location on the side of the property along with its relationship to the road and the car park, the proposed extension would be highly visible within the public realm.
6. The Council's Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2006 states that single storey side extensions should be

subordinate additions to the main dwelling, with a clear setback from the front elevation and with a width no wider than half the width of the existing dwelling. The width of the proposed extension would be over half that of the host dwelling and it would also adjoin the existing porch, sitting forward of the main front elevation of the dwelling, contrary to the guidance with the SPD. Although the SPD is for guidance only, these contrary factors would result in a large and overly dominant addition to the property, which would not be subordinate compared to the modest size of the existing building. An extension with a smaller width may not meet the minimum standards for rooms sizes inside the dwelling, however this would not justify the proposal's overly dominant appearance and impact upon the host dwelling.

7. The proposal would retain the footpath and a small area of grass to the side of the extension. However the extension would still partially block the current open space to the side of the property, reducing its spacious nature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the streetscene. Although the land is privately owned and could be fenced off, subject to permitted development rights, this would be a much smaller structure than the proposed extension and, although it would have some impact on the openness of the area, it would be much less imposing than the proposed development.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018). This policy requires new development to respond to the local character with a suitable scale to the setting of the site, making a positive contribution to the street frontage.

Other Matters

9. Several similar side extensions have been brought to my attention by the appellant at 18 Mariette Way, 12 Plesman Way and 14 Sunkist Way. Although these all relate to side extensions at the end of a terrace, due to their positioning, they all have limited visibility within the streetscene and therefore are not directly comparable to the appeal before me.

Conclusions and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR