



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/24/3355891

5 Woodcote Avenue, Wallington, Sutton SM6 0QR

- 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 Mrs S Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref. is DM2024/00942.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a two storey side extension, single storey ground floor 2.987m width side/corner infill extension with flat roof and roof glazing, following demolition of the single storey garage and bay windows to side. alteration to front entrance door with glazing to sides. change external render finish to brick slips to ground floor level front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounds, including the Woodcote Avenue Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached, two-storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof on Woodcote Avenue, in a largely residential neighbourhood. It is at the eastern end of a row of five properties of similar scale and design, with two-storey front and side bay window features. The group are characterised by gaps between the houses allowing for views to the rear, which gives a feeling of spaciousness to the row.
 4. There is no prevailing architectural style to most other houses in the neighbourhood, which is characterised by buildings of differing size, design, detailing and external materials. However, in many instances gaps between built form abound, particularly at first floor level. My observations are reflected in the Sutton Local Plan 2018 (LP), which amongst other things states that, *"Properties are spacious, giving great separation between houses."*
 5. The appeal proposal includes a two-storey side element that would broadly fill the gap between the host dwelling and the flank boundary with no.7 Woodcote Avenue. This would erode the sense of openness that I have identified as important to the street scene, and conflict with the spatial characteristics of the row of dwellings of which the appeal unit is a part. The result would be a discordant form of development completely at odds with the spacious setting. It would also mean the loss of the two-storey side bay window feature, which further adds to my concerns.
 6. The property would be clearly visible from the public highway, drawing attention for its incongruous nature. The residence would be dominant as a result. Rather than add to the visual diversity and interest of the street scene, the proposal would be harmful to and incompatible with the character of the area.
-

7. I acknowledge that the impact of the scheme on the amenities of adjoining occupiers would not be significant, that it would be constructed in materials to match those used on the existing dwelling, and the element would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling at first floor level and down from the main ridge line to create some sense of subservience. However, these issues do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. I also recognise the presence of other additions to houses in the vicinity, nonetheless many of these are to dwellings of substantially different size and design and as such are not comparable to the development before me. 9 and 11 Woodcote Avenue have been extended, but this appears to be mainly at the rear; the gaps between the buildings have been retained to either side. In any event, the appearance of other schemes would be a neutral consideration in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
9. I therefore conclude that the scheme would be injurious to the character and appearance of the surrounds, including the ASLC. It would run contrary to Policies 28 and 30 of the LP, which together seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other factors advanced, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR