
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/24/3355664
15 Belmont Road, Sutton SM2 6DW

- 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 & Mrs Lewis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref. is DM2024/01229.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 17 Belmont Road with regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site consists of a mid-terrace, two-storey house on Belmont Road in high density, urban surrounds. The street scene is generally residential in nature comprising other houses of broadly similar size and design, with some commercial outlets to the south on and around the junction with Station Road.
4. Although the front elevations of buildings in the vicinity display uniformity, at my visit I observed that there is greater variation at the rear. Many dwellings have been extended with additions of differing height and form, which are eclectic in their design with a range of external facing materials such as brickwork and render, and a variety of different fenestration types and roof tiles.
5. Taken in the round, in this context I consider that the appeal scheme would visually connect with the general appearance of the existing dwelling, and its low level nature would prevent a dominating influence or result in a contrived design solution. I am satisfied that views of the development from neighbouring gardens would not be adversely affected, and the scheme would not be evident from the public domain.
6. I therefore conclude that the scheme would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area. It would comply with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 (LP) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4: The Design of Residential Extensions (SPD), which together seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Living conditions

7. The substantial rearward projection and height of the single storey rear extension would significantly increase the size and scale of development facing the neighbouring residence at 17 Belmont Road, thereby adding material bulk to the built form in close proximity to the common boundary.
8. In doing so, this would create a considerable extent of development which would dominate the outlook from the rear openings of no. 17, which include a window and glazed door, and the environment in and around the patio and back garden. This would be in a manner which would be overbearing and oppressive, and materially worse than the existing state of affairs.
9. In terms of loss of light to the adjoining dwelling no robust information, for example in the form of sunlight projections using Building Research Establishment guidelines, has been provided as part of the appeal. Given the depth of the development and its proximity to the neighbouring windows and patio area, in the absence of any cogent evidence to the contrary, I consider that there would be a loss of light that would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants therein.
10. While I accept that no concerns were raised about the planning application from the residents of no.17, this is a matter that carries limited weight in my assessment as the lack of objection does not, on its own, justify the scheme.
11. I consider that the proposal would be injurious to the living conditions of the occupiers of 17 Belmont Road in relation to outlook, overbearing impact and light. This would fail to meet with Policy 29 of the LP and the SPD, which seek to ensure that development does not harm the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above and all other issues, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR