



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3263047

28 Grosvenor Road, Wallington, SM6 0EF

- 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 F. Lau against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/00963, dated 2 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatory, erection of single storey rear extension, conversion of existing garage into a habitable room including alterations to the roof and installation of a new door and window to the covered flank area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Procedural Matter

3. The description of development used in the header above is based on that used on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice as it describes the proposal more accurately than that description given on the application form.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of 30 Grosvenor Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character & Appearance

5. The appeal site accommodates a modest two-storey dwelling located in an established residential area characterised for the most part by semi-detached
-

properties. The host dwelling features a rear conservatory as well as a single storey side extension along its eastern flank. There is also a pitched roof garage and a small store located to the rear of the property along the eastern boundary of the site.

6. The single storey rear extension would represent an increase in built form at ground level by over 6.4 m in depth from the main part of the house. Though I note the presence of the existing conservatory, which the extension would replace, the extension would be unduly excessive as it would represent an increase by more than half the depth of the original dwelling. Despite being only single storey, it would not appear as a subordinate or proportionate addition and it would fail to harmonise adequately with the modest scale of the host dwelling. I note an adequate amount of garden space would remain however this would not outweigh the disproportionate depth of the extension and its effect on the architectural integrity of the host dwelling.
7. Viewed in conjunction with the existing extensions and outbuildings, the development would also create a crammed appearance to the rear of the appeal property. The scale and extent of the resultant built form would thus fail to sympathetically complement the host dwelling.
8. The appellant states that the development would not disturb the street scene or be visible from the public realm however it would easily be seen by surrounding properties, including from the rear elevations of the properties along Taylor Road, directly to the west of the appeal site.
9. Furthermore, I acknowledge a number of neighbouring properties feature rear extensions and outbuildings however these appear to be of a smaller scale than what is proposed and do not seem to have negatively impacted their host dwellings. They are not comparable to the scheme before me and I therefore do not attribute any positive weight to this point.
10. Given the above, I therefore find the proposal would result in an unsympathetic and insubordinate form of development. It would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. I therefore consider that the proposed development would conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (the 'local plan') which seeks to ensure new alterations and extensions are designed to the highest standard, respect local context, and are of a suitable scale and massing. It would also be contrary to the 'Design of Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document which states that rear extensions should be subordinate to the main dwelling.

Living Conditions

11. The proposed rear extension would have a considerable depth of 6.474 m and would abut the boundary with the neighbouring property at 30 Grosvenor Road. Although the proposed development would project slightly above the outbuilding sited to the rear of No.30 and on the common boundary with No.28, it would not be perceived as being an excessively tall structure. Indeed, whilst the top flank of the extension would be visible to the neighbouring occupiers from their ground floor windows and patio area, it would mostly be screened by the outbuilding and would not appear obtrusive or overly dominant. In light of its limited single storey height, the proposed extension would not markedly or unreasonably alter the neighbouring occupiers' rear outlook and would therefore not unacceptably erode their living conditions.

12. Given the above, the development would not conflict with Policy 29 of the local plan which seeks to ensure developments do not adversely affect the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

Planning Balance and Recommendation

13. Although I find the development would not negatively affect the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 30 Grosvenor Road with regards to outlook, this does not outweigh the adverse impact the development would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan
14. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. 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