

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2022

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/21/3289812

185 Longfellow Road, Worcester Park KT4 8BA

- 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 Alpesh Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application, Ref. DM2021/00875, dated 28 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two storey rear extension; extension to existing single storey side entrance porch; installation of a first floor flank window and conversion of loft space involving alteration to the existing roof line and a dormer extension at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part one, part two storey rear extension; extension to existing single storey side entrance porch; installation of a first floor flank window and conversion of loft space involving alteration to the existing roof line and a dormer extension at the rear at 185 Longfellow Road, Worcester Park KT4 8BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. DM2021/00875, dated 28 April 2021, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Main Issue

2. The appeal scheme is a resubmission of application Ref. DM2020/00484 which was refused permission by Notice dated 10 June 2020. That application was refused for three reasons: (i) the effect of the extensions on the character of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; (ii) the effect on the living conditions as regards outlook for neighbouring occupiers, and (iii) the under-provision of one parking space. The officer's report for the appeal application explains why reasons (ii) and (iii) above no longer apply and that the development was refused only for reason (i) above.

Reasons

3. No.185 Longfellow Road is an end of terrace house in a tightly knit residential area where the majority of houses are terraced or semi-detached on narrow plots with a minimal front building line to the road. No. 185 is also part of a group between Nos. 171 & 191 that have long back gardens. Within this group there is a variety of house styles, including No. 181 next to the appeal dwelling which is a 1960's infill development and No. 191 which, as the grounds of appeal point out, has had major alterations and additions. In addition there is a
-

wide variety of ground floor rear extensions to the houses along this part of the road.

4. I acknowledge that the appeal dwelling with its two storey outrigger and a resultant L-shape is an example of building of some character that a number of councils of London Boroughs seek to preserve through the discouragement or preclusion of wraparound extensions. However, in this case the original character of this section of Longfellow Road has long since been devalued through the aforementioned infill development and the wide range of alterations and additions. The situation therefore is quite different to localities where this original house type is predominant and an important part of the character and appearance of the area (in some instances a conservation area).
5. The depth of the extension beyond the rear wall of the outrigger would be modest, with the extent of the building's footprint little different to those of Nos. 181 and 187, whilst the first floor and the hip to gable roof extensions were the subject of a similar scheme granted permission in 2016. More importantly, the proposal would not noticeably affect the street scene, with the additions at most glimpsed rather than drawing the eye. And with little in terms of character merit to safeguard to the rear of these dwellings, I do not consider that the Council has clearly demonstrated a case for withholding consent.
6. Overall, I conclude that the proposed extensions would not be in harmful conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018; the guidance contained within SPD4 'Design of Residential Extensions', and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. I shall therefore allow the appeal.
7. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans (as listed in the Notice of Refusal) is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. A matching external materials condition will secure a harmonious development and safeguard visual amenity. Finally, a condition preventing the flat roof being accessed and used for amenity purposes will ensure that there would be no overlooking and loss of privacy for the occupiers of Nos. 181 and 187.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans including the annotations thereon: Drawing Nos. 01; 02; JN/AP1; JN/AP/03; JN/AP/04; JN/AP/05; JN/AP/06; JN/AP/07; JN/AP/08;
- 3) 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;
- 4) The flat roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used, all or in part, as a terrace or other amenity space. No railings, fences, walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected on this roof and no alterations shall be carried out to the elevation of the application property to form access on to the roof.