



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/24/3357751

13 Winchester Mews, Worcester Park KT4 8QL

- 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 Raj Pareek against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2024/01485.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The proposal comprises a number of elements, including a loft conversion and rear dormer, an additional window on the flank wall and the provision of a cycle store to the side. The Council raised no concerns regarding the additional window and the cycle store, and given their modest scale in relation to the form and the proportions of the main house, I have no reason to take a different view.
3. The main issue in this appeal is therefore the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached property within a small development of houses to the rear of Clarkes Avenue and within a predominantly residential area. Within Winchester Mews there is a mix of detached, semi-detached and short terraces, with the houses facing towards the rear of properties within Clarkes Avenue and at the rear towards St. Anthony's Hospital and associated buildings.
5. The proposal would seek to convert the loft space to residential accommodation with a box dormer on the rear roof slope. Although it would be set down from the roof ridge and set in from the sides of the roof, it would still be a very large and bulky addition to the main roof slope. The existing houses are of modest scale and proportions and given its width and form the proposed dormer would appear out of scale with the existing property and an over dominant addition to the property.
6. Furthermore, the windows would not relate in style and siting with the windows in the existing property and this would exacerbate the visual over prominence of the proposed roof extension.

7. The proposal would be at the rear, but it would be seen from the rear gardens of the surrounding properties and given its scale and bulky form, it would be an over prominent and visually intrusive addition to the detriment of the character and appearance of the local area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing house and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 and the Supplementary Planning Document 4: Design of Residential Extensions, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to the presence of other rear dormers in the local vicinity. Each proposal must be judged on its individual merits, but to the extent that the information has been made available to me I have taken these other roof dormers into account. However, none of them compares directly with the proposal before me and do not persuade me to a different view.
10. There is no objection to the principle of seeking to use the loft space to accommodate the personal needs of the Appellant family, but this does not override the harm I have concluded from the particular proposal before me. The proposed dormer extension would not harm the living conditions of immediate neighbours and the Council has not raised an objection in this regard. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have concluded to the character and appearance of the existing building and on the local area as a result of the proposal before me.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR