



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3306372

125 St Agathas Grove, Sutton, Carshalton, SM5 1DW.

- 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 Kiribhai Willimbhai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2022/00638, dated 31 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part and thereby the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 125 St Agathas Grove is one dwelling, in one of two short terraces of four two-storey dwellings each. I understand from the evidence that it previously had a small porch facing the street, similar to that at number 127.
4. The appellant has removed the porch and built a single storey, flat roof, full width front extension.
5. Policy 28 of the London Borough of Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (Adopted February 2018) (LP) states, amongst other things, that alterations and extensions should be attractive and designed to the highest standard, make a positive contribution to the street frontage, and respect the local context and respond to local character.
6. The extension only projects some 1.6 metres in front of the main façade of the house and terrace of which it is part. Nevertheless, particularly due to its contrasting finish and form it appears as a prominent and incongruous addition in this context and thereby denudes the architectural integrity of the property. Further, it serves to unbalance both the terrace of which it is part and the adjacent neighbouring terrace.

7. I noted that full width front extensions are to be found on similar properties in nearby roads. Nevertheless, I consider that to allow this one would cause harm to the streetscene here. Furthermore, whatever the background to those additions, their existence, even in nearby roads is not an appropriate justification, in this case for permitting one here.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part and thereby the street scene. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of LP Policy 28 and the London Borough of Sutton Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document *Design of Residential Extensions-SPD4* (Adopted October 2006) as they relate to the quality of development and the need for development to make a positive contribution to the street frontage, respect the local context and respond to local character.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR