



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D21/3282699

81 Boundary Road, Wallington SM6 0TA

- 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 and Mrs Parkyn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref: DM2021/01404 dated 5 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension and part two storey part single storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. Planning permission was granted by the Council for a similar form of development in May 2021, under its Reference DM2021/0048 but the proposals before me seek to bring the first floor flank wall closer to the shared boundary line with No 83. The main issue in this appeal is therefore the effect of the proposed side extension on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the east side of Boundary Road within a predominantly residential area. The east side of the road generally comprises pairs of semi-detached properties with a greater variety of dwellings on the western side. However, the predominant pattern of development on both sides of the road comprises well spaced dwellings giving a sense of openness to the street scene. A number of properties have been extended, including to the side, but the open spacing between properties, particularly at first floor and above, remains part of the character and appearance of the local area.
4. The proposal would extend up to the boundary line with No 83 at both ground floor and first floor under a hipped roof. No 83 has previously been extended almost to the boundary line over two storeys. As a result, the openness between the two properties would be almost completely lost, leading to a terracing effect that would appear cramped and visually discordant in the street scene. I have taken into account that there would be a small difference in the eaves height between the two properties and the hipped roofs as existing to No

- 83 and as proposed to the appeal property, but these design features would not be sufficient to overcome the harm I have found.
5. The difference in width of the proposed scheme compared with the approved scheme would be relatively minor but it would in my view be sufficient to lead to an overly wide extension which would virtually obliterate any open gap between the two properties. It would harm the spacious character and appearance of the street scene.
 6. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would materially harm the street scene. This would conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 and Design of Residential Extensions SPD4 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other things, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
 7. I have sympathy with the family related reasons for seeking the extension as proposed and the impact on the extent of building works required as a result of the flank wall inset, but these personal reasons would not outweigh the harm I have concluded.
 8. I have taken into account that there are examples of two storey extensions up to the boundary line including at No 83, but in most of these cases there remains an open gap between adjacent properties, particularly at first floor level and above. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of examples where two storey side extensions have been built flush to other two storey development, in the wider area, including an appeal decision in London Road under Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3252893. I have taken account of these, although limited information is available to me, but each proposal must be considered on its individual merits and they do not persuade me that more should be permitted, given the harm I have concluded in the particular circumstances of this case and the characteristics of the local street scene.
 9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR