

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/D/21/3287326

12 Mottistone Grove, Sutton SM2 6FE

- 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 Shozeb Haider against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application, Ref. DM2021/01890, dated 17 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side and rear extension; provision of a terrace/patio area to the side of the dwelling and provision of an extract flue to the flank of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension; provision of a terrace/patio area to the side of the dwelling and provision of an extract flue to the flank of the dwelling at 12 Mottistone Grove, Sutton in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. DM2021/01890, dated 17 September 2021, 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 development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 1-390 100 Rev. A; 21-390 101 Rev. A; 21-390 102 Rev. A; 21-390 103 Rev. A; 21-390 104 Rev. A;
 - 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 elevations of the application property to form access on to the roof.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.
-

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling has a single storey flat roof rear projection which although forming part of the original building reads as a rear extension. This feature can also be found at the adjoining property (which is the other half of the semi-detached pair) and at the other three houses of the same design on this side of Mottistone Grove.
4. The Council's concern as regards the appeal application is one of an adverse effect of the proposed rear extension because of a cumulative impact. This would arise firstly from the combination of its proposed wraparound element from the point of its attachment to the side extension already granted permission in June 2021 and secondly from its additional depth of 3m to the rear projection, a total of 5.56m from the dwelling's main rear elevation. The earlier permitted side extension is repeated as part of the current scheme and as the proposed additions can be read together this is helpful to my appraisal.
5. I acknowledge that No. 12, the adjoining No. 13 and the terrace of three houses (Nos. 14-16) have a uniform appearance because of their same design and external materials. However, the rear elevations (and to a significant degree the flank elevation of the appeal dwelling No. 12) cannot be seen from the public domain. And to the extent that this uniformity has aesthetic merit, it is already partly compromised by the dividing garden fences and other domestic paraphernalia, including at one of the dwellings a garden shed near the rear wall. It is the coherent design of the frontage of the houses in Mottistone Grove that by far makes the most positive contribution.
6. Furthermore, as the end dwelling of the group No 12 has a particularly large garden. And the plans of the side and rear extension show a proposal that, although substantial, would appear of modest size in a large plot and have an appearance in keeping with the host dwelling including a height the same as the existing rear projection.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal scheme would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of No. 12 and its surroundings. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018; SPD 4 'Design of Residential Extensions' and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
8. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans will avoid uncertainty and is in the interests of proper planning. A condition stipulating matching external materials will ensure the extensions harmonise with the host dwelling and maintain visual amenity. Finally, a condition precluding the use of the flat roof for leisure or amenity purposes will safeguard neighbours from noise and disturbance and a loss of privacy.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR