



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2024

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/24/3352166

118 Sutton Common Road, Sutton, SM1 3JQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kavitha Uthayakumar against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2024/00622.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a part one, part two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part one, part two storey side and rear extension at 118 Sutton Common Road, Sutton, SM1 3JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2024/01213, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved document and plans: Fire Strategy, Drawing Nos: 0-1, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 Revision A, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15
 - 3) The materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension to the existing dwelling hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the street scene.

Reasons

3. This part of Sutton Common Road is characterised by uniformly designed pairs of two storey houses and short terraces from a range of designs and palette of materials. The appeal dwelling occupies a particularly large and prominent plot adjacent to the junction of Sutton Common Road and St John's Road.
4. The appeal dwelling comprises one of a pair of symmetrically designed semi-detached houses with a fully hipped roof. They have two storey gable fronted adjoining projections, with modest sized projecting porches to the side of them. Whilst the front and side elevations of the appeal dwelling are fully rendered

with exposed timber detailing above ground floor level, the ground floor front elevation of the adjoining dwelling (No.115), is brick faced with render and exposed timber work above. To the side of the appeal dwelling is a wide single storey extension that projects close to the side boundary of the property, where there is a tall timber fence.

5. There is a uniformly designed pair of semi-detached houses alongside the appeal dwelling and No.115, although their design and detailing is different. Diagonally opposite the appeal dwelling, fronting Sutton Common Road, is terrace of three houses with very similar detailing to the appeal dwelling, although their roofs are gabled to the sides. On the opposite side of St John's Road is a pair of semi-detached houses which have attached gable fronted projections, although their detailing is materially different to that of the appeal dwelling.
6. Regarding corner properties, the majority of dwellings in the local area are set back from the side boundary which fronts onto a highway. Notwithstanding this there are a number of dwellings and extensions in the local area that project up to or very close to the adjacent roads and they have typically blended in appropriately with the street scene.
7. Amongst other things policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 (SLP), requires new development to be attractive and designed to the highest standard. It should respect local context; respond to local character; and make a positive contribution to the street frontage and street scene. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Design of Residential Extensions (SPD) is consistent with this. SPD section A.2 advises that as a general rule of thumb side extensions should be no more than one third to one half the width of the existing front elevation. Side extensions should be set back from the front elevation and down from the ridge line of the host dwelling. However, SPD paragraph 3.1.5 advises that an integrated design approach, where an extension is read as part of the original dwelling can work well on some dwellings.
8. The proposed extension would follow an integrated approach. The front elevation of the proposed side extension would be almost a mirror image of the host dwelling, other than the absence of a front porch. It would also reflect the size and proportions of some of the short terraces along Sutton Common Road, including the terrace opposite. The proposed outer side elevation would project a short distance beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling and would be the same depth as the existing single storey wrap around extension. The proposed single storey rear extension would infill the gap between the retained rear extension and the proposed two storey extension. The roof form, fenestration and external materials and finishes of the proposed extensions would all reflect those of the existing dwelling.
9. As stated in the SPD, achieving a good materials match can be difficult. In this instance, the outer walls of the dwelling are finished with painted render and timber work. Accordingly, it should not be difficult to achieve a good match. As stated by the Council the use of matching materials is a matter that could be secured by condition. The council has also suggested conditions which require the proposal to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and fire safety strategy. These conditions would be necessary to ensure the

development respected the host dwelling and the street scene and in the interests of fire safety.

10. For these reasons the resultant dwelling would appear well balanced. Whilst the extension would be the same width of the existing dwelling, it would respect the uniform appearance of the host dwelling and the pair of dwellings. Also, together with the attached dwelling at No.116 it would have the appearance of a traditionally and uniformly designed short terrace. In this respect it would be consistent with the integrated approach described in SPD Paragraph 3.1.5 and Figure 3.
11. The proposed two storey extension would occupy a prominent position within the street scene, close to the junction of Sutton Common Road and St Johns Road, where it would project up to the back edge of the pavement. As stated above the proposed extensions would respect the host dwelling and other dwellings in the immediate area. Most of the nearby pairs of dwellings project close to their side boundaries and there is a terrace of six dwellings a short distance to the southeast of the appeal site. This visually results in an almost continuous line of dwellings with occasional wider gaps.
12. As stated above, there are some dwellings that project up to or close to adjacent roads off Sutton Common Road, including the front corner of the dwelling located diagonally opposite. The section of St. John's Road adjacent to the appeal property is already flanked by tall fences with the existing side extension on the appeal site located close to the highway boundary. Whilst the proposed two storey side extension would add to the sense of enclosure, it would not look out of place and would benefit from the street trees and planting provided by the grass verges on both sides of this part of St John's Road. For these reasons the proposed dwelling would respect and relate appropriately to the street scene.
13. Finally, it is acknowledged that the proposed two storey extension would exceed some of the rule of thumb guidelines set out in the SPD. However, as stated in SPD paragraphs 1.1 and 3.02 each case must be assessed on its merits. The advice set out in the SPD provides an overview of the points that need to be taken into consideration when seeking to accommodate and address principles of good design.
14. I conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the street scene. Accordingly, it would comply with SLP Policy 28 and the objectives of the SPD.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR