



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2024

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/24/3349573

32 Grosvenor Road, Wallington, SM6 0EF

- 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 Niranjan Kandasamy against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2024/00617.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a part one, part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part one, part two storey rear extension at 32 Grosvenor Road, Wallington, SM6 0EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2024/00617, 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, Location Plan and Drawing Nos: N/654/01-32; N/654/02-32, N/654/03-32; N/654/04-32, N/654/SP1-32
 - 3) The materials 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 Issues

2. The First main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the host dwelling and the area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 53 and 55 Taylor Road (No.53 and No.55), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. Grosvenor Road is predominantly characterised by a broad mix of detached and semi-detached two storey family houses that occupy varied sized and shaped plots. Some of the properties have two storey side extensions, which project close to their side boundaries. Also, within the rear garden environments there are a diverse range of single and two storey projections, extensions and dormer additions. This is in addition to numerous ancillary outbuildings.

4. The appeal property is located close to a bend in the highway and is set back from the street behind a comparatively deep front garden. The dwelling, which occupies a generous sized plot comprises a traditionally designed two storey semi-detached dwelling with a half-hipped roof that has a small parapet to the side. On one side of the front elevation is a first floor projecting bay with a fully hipped roof and on the other side is a single storey projection with a mono-pitched roof.
5. To the rear the appeal dwelling does not have any solid extensions, although it has a large deep, full width timber framed veranda. To the rear of the attached semi-detached house is a part single and part two storey extension that is currently being constructed. It appears very similar in form and depth to the proposed extension, with the two storey element being located a short distance from the boundary with 28 Grosvenor Road.
6. On the opposite side of the appeal dwelling are the rear boundaries of No.53 and No.55. Along this boundary there is a tall brick wall with outbuildings just beyond it. The garden at No.55 is some 20 metres in length and the garden at No.53 is slightly shorter following the construction of an extension.
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. SLP Policy 29 seeks to ensure that new development does not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties due to loss of outlook.
8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Design of Residential Extensions 2006 (SPD), has similar objectives. It seeks to ensure that extensions do not have a negative impact on the host dwelling, the street scene or the living conditions of local residents. As stated in SPD paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 each case must be assessed on its individual merits. The SPD provides a practical guide for residential extensions for both the public and decision makers.
9. SPD section A.2 advises that as a rule of thumb, due to the harm that can be caused to the existing dwelling and the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties two storey rear extensions will be resisted. Stated exceptions to this include rear extensions to semi-detached houses where they occupy spacious plots and there are substantial distances between boundaries and adjacent dwellings. Any such extension should be in keeping with the host dwelling, the character of the area and should not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
10. SPD paragraphs 3.4.2 & 3.4.3 advise that permission will be unlikely to be granted where an extension would over-dominate the outlook from principal windows and/or the immediate rear garden area of neighbouring properties. To prevent this, extensions should be sited away from the party boundary and a separation distance of 14 metres between side and rear elevations is provided.

Character and appearance

11. The proposed extension would project some 3.6 metres into the rear garden, with the first floor element being slightly shallower. Even with the extension

the Appeal property's rear garden would remain spacious and one of the deepest rear gardens in the immediate area. Whilst the appeal dwelling and the proposed extension would project up to the boundary with No.53 & No.55, the rear gardens to the west and the distance between the appeal property and the adjacent dwellings in Taylors Road would continue to add to the sense of space around the appeal property.

12. The single storey element of the proposed extension would replace the existing veranda and would be the same depth as the single storey rear extension currently being built at No.30. The design of the proposed fenestration would match that of the host dwelling and would align with the retained first floor rear windows. The first floor element of the proposed extension would be less than half the width of the dwelling and would have a fully pitched roof which would blend in with the existing main roof and reflect the front facing projecting gable roof. As stated on the submitted drawings the external materials and finishes would match the host dwelling. The use of matching materials and adherence to the submitted plans are both matters that can be secured through the imposition of conditions.
13. As a result of these factors the proposed extension would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the property would continue to benefit from a spacious rear garden environment. The proposed extension would not be noticeable from the street scene. This is due to the depth of the Appeal property's front garden; the screening provided by the existing dwelling and outbuilding at 34 Grosvenor Road; and the outbuildings and planting within the gardens of the surrounding properties. Where the flank wall of the two storey element of the extension could be glimpsed it would be at a distance, fleeting and lower than the existing flank wall.
14. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Accordingly, it would comply with SLP Policy 28 and the design advice set out in the SPD.

Living conditions

15. The outer side wall of the two storey part of the proposed extension would increase the depth of the flank wall of the appeal dwelling, although its roof would be materially lower and hipped away from the side boundary with No.53 & No.55. Also, the proposed extension would be partially screened from these dwellings and their gardens by the existing outbuildings and the tall boundary wall between the appeal site.
16. Although the proposed extension would not be set in from the side boundary, it would materially exceed the 14 metre distance between dwellings as set out in the SPD. Due to the depth of the rear gardens at No.53, No.55 and No.57, together with the space to the front, rear and over the resultant dwelling, the existing dwellings in Taylors Road, would retain a sense of openness within the rear garden environment.
17. For these reasons whilst the proposal would not comply with the precise advice set out in the SPD, it would comply with the objectives of that advice. It would also comply with LP Policy 29, which weighs in favour of the proposal.

18. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.53 or No.55 due to loss of outlook. Accordingly, the proposal complies with SLP Policy 29 and the objectives of the SPD.

Conclusion

19. Having regard to the conclusions on both main issues and having regard to all matters raised the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR