



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2021

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3274123

38 Butter Hill, Wallington SM6 7JD.

- 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 Antanas Naravas against the decision of London Borough of Sutton
 - The application Ref DM2021/00279, dated 11 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2021
 - The development proposed is 'single storey rear extension and double-storey side extension. Double storey extension shall be offset back by 50mm from the front building line'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the original description.
3. The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. I am satisfied that the equivalent policies in the revised Framework have broadly the same approach as their counterparts, and they do not alter my conclusions on the matter in any case.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located at approximately midway along Butter Hill. There are turns in the road in both directions leading away from the site, creating a relatively limited streetscene near to the appeal site. There is a notable difference in character on either side of the road on Butter Hill. On the same side of the road as the appeal site is a terraced shop parade with flats above and a detached dwelling at a turn in the road. Other than those exceptions, the predominant type of building on that side is semi-detached hipped-roof dwellings. The appeal site is typical of one of those semi-detached pairs, which are of the same type, scale and design, resulting in a sense of uniformity within that localised part of Butter Hill. The built form on

the opposite side of Butter Hill is more varied, modern and is of a generally greater height and mass.

6. The pattern of development in the vicinity is relatively tight, though there is some variation in the width of gaps between buildings. This pattern provides limited opportunity for side and roof extension without creating an overdeveloped, cramped or terraced appearance. The appeal site is no exception to this; despite the narrow width of the proposed extension, the appeal scheme would nonetheless bring the built form and mass of development much closer to the boundary with a full two-storey plus roof extension height and mass. Consequently, the side and roof extension would interrupt the overall pattern of development by infilling a gap within the streetscene and would create a cramped, dominant appearance within the plot.
7. Clear effort has been made to reduce the dominance and mass of the extension through the incorporation of limited set-back and set-downs within design of the scheme, albeit these do not comply with the suggested minimums in Supplementary Planning Document 4. Nonetheless, the resulting overall width, coupled with the prominent additional mass at roof level would create an imbalanced appearance across the semi-detached pair and would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling.
8. Whilst there are some examples of combined hip-to-gable and side extensions on dwellings in other surrounding roads, the overall form of development would be out of keeping with the modest proportions prevalent in the row of the uniform building type, of which the appeal site forms a part.
9. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would fail to respond the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan, adopted 2018, as well as the principles contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 4. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high standard of design which respects the local context and responds to local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR