



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: 22ND March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3307778

48 Clarkes Avenue, Sutton, Worcester Park, KT4 8PZ

- 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 Chassan Latif against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2022/01101, dated 14 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as *side extension to a single storey 3 bedroom bungalow to create a larger living room/dining room, a further en-suite bedroom and an alternative entry directly into the corridor area.*
-

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 and thereby the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 48 Clarkes Avenue is a detached bungalow. It is located behind frontage properties and is accessed via a narrow driveway between numbers 46 and 50 Clarkes Avenue. Accordingly, there are limited views of the dwelling from Clarkes Avenue. Nevertheless, it is seen in the context of surrounding development.
4. A single storey hipped roofed extension is proposed to provide an enlarged living room, en-suite bedroom and small enclosed internal courtyard.
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 and respect the local context and respond to local character.
6. As designed the plan form of extension would be very narrow in comparison to the width of the host property and would extend in front of the main façade and project into the rear garden behind the rear wall of the existing bungalow.
7. The designer, rather than integrating the extension's roof with that of the host property has proposed a hipped roof which would simply abut that of the host

property at eaves level resulting in a long, enclosed valley gutter. Accordingly, the proposed extension would, in my judgement appear as a contrived, incongruous alien addition to the existing bungalow.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension by reason of its overall design would cause significant harm to architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the local area. To allow the development 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, amongst other things the quality of development and the need for development to respect the local context and respond to local character.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of objection from neighbouring occupiers, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR