



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: 24 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3255888

27 Acacia Drive, SUTTON, SM3 9NJ

- 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 M Rice against the decision of London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/00265, dated 19 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as extension at first floor side elevation and roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi-detached with a single storey side extension, together with single storey rear extensions. The general character of dwellings along Acacia Drive is of semi-detached dwellings with predominantly hipped roof forms of similar design incorporating bay windows.
4. The proposal would extend the property at first level up to the existing side boundary. By virtue of the lack of set back from the front elevation, the lack of set down from the roof and the gable end, the proposal would appear a dominant addition which would fail to appear a subservient and sympathetic addition to the existing property. Furthermore, the gable roof form would uncharacteristically close the gap between properties at roof level and would also unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. By virtue of the above, the proposal would fail to integrate successfully into the street scene.
5. The rear dormer would be of substantial size and would extend approximately the full width of the proposed extended roof. The design is imposing in scale and mass and would be a bulky and intrusive feature. Together with the existing rear extensions the proposed rear dormer would dominate the rear of the property appearing visually intrusive on the rear elevation. Overall, the proposal would be of a scale and bulk that would harm the character and appearance of the area and the existing dwelling.
6. I have had regard to existing two storey side extensions along Acacia Drive and in the wider area which have not been set back from the front elevation. However, I am not aware of the planning circumstances behind these.

Nevertheless, their existence does not persuade me the appeal proposal would be acceptable. In this regard, I also observed an example of a side extension along Acacia Drive, which is set back from the front elevation with a hipped roof to match the existing dwelling which appears more sympathetic in the street scene. In any event, I do not find the proposal before me acceptable when assessed against the current development plan and the Council's Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 4 (2006) (SPD). Whilst I acknowledge a set back from the front elevation reduces available internal space, this cannot outweigh the harm identified.

7. For the reasons above, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and the existing dwelling. Accordingly, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) and the SPD. Together, amongst other matters these seek that development including extensions should be designed to the highest standards, respect local context, is of a suitable scale and massing to the setting of the site and townscape, should be in sympathy with the existing dwelling and extensions should play a subordinate approach to the main dwelling and make a positive contribution to the street frontage.

Conclusion

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

S Thomas

INSPECTOR