



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3284086

62 Browning Avenue, Worcester Park KT4 8LD

- 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 Mrs Diane Armstrong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/01213, dated 9 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension measuring 6m x 4.62m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear extension measuring 6m x 4.62m in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DM2021/01213, dated 9 June 2021, including the plans listed in the attached Schedule.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the local area.

Reasons

3. 62 Browning Avenue is a mid-terrace 2 storey house within a residential area. The proposed single storey, flat roofed rear extension has already been built, in place of a much smaller previous extension. The appeal is therefore for retrospective planning permission. The walls of the house are finished in pebbledash while the new extension is finished in white render.
1. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Design of Residential Extensions* (SPD) advises that extensions must be subordinate, proportionate and respectful of the original house. The SPD's guidelines for single storey rear extensions on terraced dwellings say that they should not project more than 2.7m at the back and should be no higher than 2.5m to the eaves or flat roof.
2. At 6m deep and over 3m high, extending almost the full width of the plot, the appeal extension is well in excess of the SPD's guidelines. Nevertheless, it fits in well with the house and its context. The main house remains the visually

dominant element and sufficient garden space is retained. The houses to either side have (smaller) flat roofed rear extensions which hide much of the bulk of the appeal extension. The extension therefore does not appear to be disproportionate or cramped development. It can be glimpsed in public views from a nearby junction but is not intrusive or harmful in those views. It would likewise not be harmful in views from houses to the rear, which are set away and at an angle. This is a good quality structure, with a contemporary style that complements the house.

3. The appellant refers to a number of other 6m deep rear extensions in the local area. I could not see these on my site visit and note that most or all of them were approved through a prior approval process under the terms of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, rather than through a full planning application. I have not given these other cases significant weight in my assessment.
4. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the house or the local area. It accords with the aims of Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 Policy 28, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, to secure attractive, high quality development that respects the local context and responds to local character.
5. I have also considered the other points raised by an objector, including a question about the accuracy of the submitted plans in relation to the height of the structure. The plans leave out an external step down to the rear garden, so do appear to slightly understate the height of the extension above garden level. This discrepancy is not, however, significant enough to merit a requirement to change the plans or to refuse planning permission.
6. Because the appeal extension is largely screened on both sides by the neighbouring extensions, it does not unduly impact the outlook or light at those properties, which continue to benefit from relatively open southerly aspects. Other concerns about whether the extension was built over a sewer and about fumes and smoke from a wood burning stove are matters to be dealt with under other legislation, if necessary.
7. No conditions are needed here as the development has been carried out acceptably. The approved plans are listed below for clarity. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Approved Plans

Location plan, Site Plan, A100, A101, A102, A103, A104 (black and white axonometric view), A104 (coloured axonometric views), A106, A107, A119, and A120.