



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/23/3327523

234 Collingwood Road, Sutton SM1 2NX

- 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 Mariadas Suresh against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2023/00819, dated 16 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side and rear extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a first-floor side and rear extension at 234 Collingwood Road, Sutton SM1 2NX in accordance with the terms of the application, 00819, dated 16 May 2023 subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of the decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: Location Plan, TSL/SURESH/234/EXT/04, TSL/SURESH/234/EXT/03, TSL/SURESH/234/EXT/02 and TSL/SURESH/234/EXT/0a and the Fire Safety Strategy Report.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The end of terrace property is located at the junction of Collingwood Road and Anton Crescent. It is part of a residential area comprising a mixture of terraced and semi-detached properties.
4. The proposed first-floor extension wrapping around the rear and side of the existing property would be inset some distance back from the front elevation and set down from the main ridgeline. It would therefore have a subordinate approach as advocated in the Council's 'Design of Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Additionally, with a rear projection

approximately half the depth of the existing single-storey extension, I do not find that it is excessive in scale.

5. The Council refer to a similar development that was proposed to No. 226 Collingwood Road which occupies a corner position and was dismissed on appeal (ref. APP/P5870/W/18/3203342). The specific details of that scheme are not before me, and it was for a dwelling rather than an extension. Nonetheless, from what I saw on site the relationship is somewhat different. Alexandra Avenue to the side of No.226 is lined with residential properties to each side and as described by the Appeal Inspector is framed by the corner properties. In contrast, Anton Crescent, to the side of the appeal property, curves around and is abutted by garaging. Additionally, to the other corner, the two-storey flank to No.242 Collingwood Road is positioned up to the boundary, and this junction does not exhibit the same spaciousness as No.226 which has a garage to the side. I therefore do not find these corner properties directly comparable and there are examples of side extensions and various other alterations to properties along Collingwood Road. This includes those adjoining the appeal property where large box-style dormers have been inserted, altering the massing and appearance of the terrace.
6. The side elevation to the appeal property is fully visible from Collingwood Road. However, given the setback and the scale of the extension, I do not find that it would be an overly prominent feature or result in a harmful enclosure of Anton Crescent. Thus, the development would not adversely impact on the character of the area.
7. The development would therefore accord with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 and the guidance contained within the SPD which requires development to achieve high standards of design and to respect the local context.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. Conditions are necessary in the interest of compliance with statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and certainty in relation to the plans and fire strategy requirements. In the interest of the appearance of the property, it is necessary to secure the external materials to match.
9. The Council has proposed a condition restricting the window in the side to obscure glazing, however, given the separation to the neighbouring property I do not find there would be any undue loss of privacy which needs to be mitigated.
10. For the reasons set out the appeal is allowed

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

