



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.08.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/23/3320377

46 Boscombe Road, Worcester Park, KT4 8PQ

- 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 Mrs Caroline Jeffcote against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2022/02233, dated 12 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor side extension and alteration to ground floor front roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The banner heading above uses the description of development that was given by the Council on their decision notice. This is a clearer and more accurate description of the proposal compared with that used on the application form which described it merely as 'FF extension'.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling occupying a corner plot with a side return boundary to Charminster Road and located within a wider residential neighbourhood comprising a mix of property types and sizes. No 46 has a hipped roof and a single-storey side extension which wraps around the front and rear elevations, and which extends up to the side boundary of the plot. The proposal is to extend the property sideways at first-floor level over the full width of the existing side extension.
5. The side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the building with a matching hipped roof and lower ridge line, in accordance with advice for two-storey side extensions contained within the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document 4 – Design of Residential Extensions* (SPD4). Although it would conflict with the SPD4 by exceeding over half the width of the existing building, I am not persuaded that the result would be a building that would

appear disproportionate or incongruous. Boscombe Road is characterised by a mix of dwelling types and sizes, including an irregular and asymmetrical short terraced row directly opposite the appeal site at Nos 39, 41 and 41a. Building widths in the area vary considerably from plot to plot and I am satisfied that the extension would not appear out of keeping with the established local pattern of development in this regard.

6. However, there is a pleasing spacious quality to both Boscombe Road and Charminster Road that is derived from a number of elements including the width of the roads, the separation distances between opposing dwellings, and their set-backs from the pavements behind garden frontages. Although No 46 extends up to the plot's side boundary and back edge of the pavement along Charminster Road at ground floor level, the space above the side extension at first-floor makes an important contribution to the open vista at the junction where Charminster Road and Boscombe Road meet. This, in turn reflects the wider distinctiveness of the locality.
7. By entirely filling the gap between the existing first-floor flank elevation of No 46 and the plot's side boundary, the extension would narrow the gap between opposing buildings at this junction and would noticeably erode the spacious qualities of the area. This would be intrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, by failing to respect the local context the proposal would fail to comply with the broad aims and objectives of SPD4 for safeguarding an area's character, and the similar aims and objectives within the Council's SPD14 - *Creating Locally Distinctive Places*. Moreover, it would directly conflict with criterion b of Policy 28: *Character and Design* of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031, adopted in 2018.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a planning permission granted at 355 Sutton Common Road for a two-storey side extension to a semi-detached dwelling located elsewhere within the borough. However, from my interpretation of the drawings that have been supplied to me as part of the appeal, the approved side extension at No 355 was set away from the side return boundary of that property. The circumstances at No 355 do not alter my findings having regard to the specific context at Boscombe Road.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR