



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3291452
134 Westminster Road, Sutton SM1 3NH

- 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 Justin Rowlinson against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/01674, dated 10 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two storey side extension. Replacement of existing paving with new permeable paving and rearrangement of on-site parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and the host property.

Reasons

3. No.134 is an end of terrace property located at a point where Westminster Road changes direction. It has a small triangular shaped rear garden but with a more generous space to the side. This space is used for parking to the front but otherwise is enclosed and presents a close boarded fence to the road positioned at the back edge of the pavement.
4. Generally, the area comprises short blocks of terraced properties of a similar scale and design, creating a regular pattern of development. Breaks in the built form at the corners contribute to its character, creating a sense of spaciousness, particularly at the upper level.
5. The proposed two storey extension would follow the form and design of the host property, although it is designed to be set down from the ridge and inset from the front elevation. The extension would therefore be screened by the existing and neighbouring properties in long views along Westminster Road. Nevertheless, it would be positioned in close proximity to the rear boundary and together with the single storey element would project some distance to the northwest. The end of the extension would effectively align with the front elevation of No.136, and whilst a large proportion would be single storey, it would have a pitched roof with the apex set marginally below the eaves of the

two-storey extension. As such, I find that the development as a whole would create a substantial mass and have a significant visual presence.

6. As referenced by the appellant development has occurred at other corners, although none of the examples are directly comparable to the design and size of the proposed development, and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits. The development nearby at Westminster Road/Wendling Road, which is a similar corner to the appeal site, is single storey, and these inner corners have more prominence in the street scene compared to the example of development to the outer corner opposite, at No.159 and No.161.
7. Therefore, while I accept that the space to the side of the property has the capacity to accommodate further development, the scale of the proposed extension would be disproportionate to the host property, and the elongated form would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development. Consequently, the extension would significantly erode the spaciousness to the corner and be harmful to the character and appearance of the street and wider area.
8. I thereby find that the development would conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 which sets out that planning permission will be granted for development provided that it, amongst other things, respects the local context and responds to local character and is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site. It would also be contrary to the supporting guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 Design of Residential Extensions.

Other matters

9. The Council have referred to the St Helier's Estate ASLC in their officer report, but no further details are before me. From the map provided by the appellant the site lies some distance from that character area and therefore is not a matter to which I have attached weight in my decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR