



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2022 by M Long BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3301933

91 Tudor Avenue, Worcester Park, Sutton KT4 8TU

- 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 P Moorhouse against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2022/00390, dated 2 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'single storey side and rear extension with pitched roof over (following demolition of the detached garage), rooms within the extended roof and insertion of roof windows in the side elevations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. After the site visit, the appellant submitted details of an approved scheme (Application Ref: DM2022/01112) regarding the demolition of the existing detached garage to the rear and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension with a reduced size compared to the appeal scheme. This evidence was accepted and will be considered in the recommendation below. The relevant documents pertaining to this application were provided by the Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring residents at Nos 89 and 93 Tudor Avenue with regard to whether there would be a loss of light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a bungalow with a detached garage located on the western side of Tudor Avenue, a residential road which rises towards the south-east. The bungalow is set back from the highway, it has a hipped roof and a gable feature above one of its two front-facing bay windows. The dwelling is viewed

at the end of a group of five bungalows on this side of the road. The group are characterised by their similar sizes, hipped roof forms and materials but they differ somewhat in their design details such as their front gable and bay window features. No 97 also has a side roof dormer which is visible from the streetscene. Opposite the site are four bungalows that contribute to this visual group, one of which, No 98, has undergone considerable works and somewhat departs from the general character of these bungalows. The appeal dwelling is separated from No 93, the bungalow to the north, by a sizeable gap that allows views of its hipped roof form towards the rear. No 89, a short distance to the south, is a two-storey property of a larger scale than the appeal dwelling.

6. The proposal would require the demolition of the existing garage and would result in a large extension to the side and rear of the property. The extension would increase the ridgeline of the property by approximately 0.55 metres to create a step up around the point at which the existing ridgeline meets the rear hipped roof slope. The proposal would incorporate a rear gable-end design.

Character and Appearance

7. The combination of the increased ridge height and gable-end design would add considerable bulk to the rear of the appeal property. The gable design would be visible from surrounding properties and the streetscene, in particular through the gap with No 93, where it would be at odds with the hipped roof forms that characterise the wider group of bungalows. There are some variations across the bungalows, however these are generally more modest in their size and visual impact than the proposal would be. The dormer at No 97, for instance, retains the overall hipped roof shape. While considerable, the works to No 89 are on the other side of the road and differ significantly from the proposal and so do not provide a precedent for the proposed scheme. There would be conflict with SPD 4¹ which seeks to ensure the design of any extension should be in sympathy with the appearance of the original dwelling.
8. When considered in isolation, the increased ridge height would not have a harmful visual impact, given it would be viewed at the end of the group of bungalows and against the greater height and scale of the property at No 89. The proposed step up would be set back from the principal elevation which would sufficiently retain its character and appearance. Nevertheless, the lack of harm identified against this aspect of the proposal would not mitigate the harm that would arise from the dominant and discordant extension to the rear.
9. There is an approved application for an extension at this site which is comparatively smaller than the proposed scheme. Moreover, this approved scheme would retain the existing ridge height and hipped roof form at the rear and so would be sympathetic to the character of the original dwelling and wider visual group. As such, this approved scheme does not provide a precedent for the proposal which would be overly bulky by virtue of the combined impact of the increased ridge height and the gable-end design.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031, adopted February 2018, which seeks to ensure that a building extension respects the local context and is of a suitable scale and massing to the setting of the site.

¹ London Borough of Sutton, SPD 4 'Design of Residential Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document' 2006

Living Conditions

11. The proposal would be set in from the shared boundaries with the neighbouring properties. As No 89 is also positioned on higher level ground, its occupiers would not experience a harmful reduction of light from the proposed scheme. No 93 has a single storey rear extension with a similar depth to the proposed scheme. Given that the proposal would not project beyond the extended rear elevation at No 93, as well as the set back of both properties from the shared boundary, there would not be a harmful loss of light to its residents.
12. As such, the proposed development would not result in harm to the neighbouring residents at No 89 and 93 with regard to light. It would therefore accord with Policy 29 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031, which seeks to prevent development that has an unacceptable impact on the residents of the surrounding area with particular consideration of sunlight and daylight. Nevertheless, the lack of harm identified in respect of living conditions would not mitigate the harm identified above with regard to the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan when considered as a whole. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR