
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3264176

Little Coppins, 14 Hall Road, Wallington, SM6 0RT

- 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 Ian Crawley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/00796, dated 5 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two front/side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part one, part two front/side/rear extension at Little Coppins, 14 Hall Road, Wallington, SM6 0RT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2020/00796, dated 5 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: HR0620-001, HR0620-002, HR0620-003, HR0620-004, Site Location Plan & Block Plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more concise than the application forms.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse with a bulky mansard roof alteration to the rear providing additional accommodation. The
-

elevations are plain and unremarkable and the property lies in a sizeable plot. The locality is generally of established good quality residential character. In contrast to the appeal property most homes locally are Victorian or Edwardian and display interesting detail and presence. The properties and their gardens all come together to form a neighbourhood of very pleasing appearance. The quality of the locality is recognised by it being an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).

5. The Council is concerned that in design terms the cumulative appearance of the extensions would fail to relate to the main dwelling, and would appear as contrived, incongruous and discordant additions.
6. It is clear that the planned extensions would be sizeable and that they would not entirely take their design cue from the existing property. In many or most instances this would be a red flag as a wish for subordination and harmony would be two tests to be rightly applied.
7. However, in certain instances, where space and context permits, it is appropriate to consider extension and alteration works as almost a complete re-modelling of a property. To my mind this is one such instance. The plot offers the space for this. The existing elevations are somewhat mundane and ordinary and could be enhanced in an area where visual variety is a characteristic. The mansard is stark and out of scale on the building as it stands and with little massing or three dimensional counter-balance. The works would add visual depth and interest. In my opinion viewing this as a completed entity would be an improvement on the present anomalous situation both on this plot and in the wider scene.
8. Policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek sympathetic design, suitable scale and protection of a streetscene distinctiveness, with, as a minimum, conserving the aesthetic qualities of an ASLC. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies. The Council's SPD4 'Design of Residential Extensions' (SPD) includes similar objectives. The SPD cannot be expected to cover every eventuality, I conclude that there would be no conflict with its aims in respect of safeguarding character and appearance.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR