



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/24/3355932

50 Rosehill Avenue, Sutton SM1 3HG

- 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 J Saad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application ref. is DM2024/00934.
 - The development proposed is the “conversion of garage into habitable space, erection of two storey wrap around extension, loft conversion with rear dormer window and Juliet balcony and installation of three front facing roof lights.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on a bend on the south side of Rosehill Avenue in a mixed residential and commercial part of Sutton. Its semi-pair is to its east and is 52 Rosehill Avenue. Owing to the bend the appeal dwelling is sited at an angle to no.48 Rosehill Avenue which is an end-of-terrace dwelling to the west. The integrated garage at the north west corner of the appeal site is very close to the flank wall of no.48.
4. The garage and living area immediately behind it are single storey. The rear garden backs onto a block of garages outside the site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and comprises a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings.
5. The proposal involves the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and the erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a first floor rear extension above part of the existing single storey rear extension. It also involves conversion of the loft space including a hip-to-gable alteration and a rear dormer. Whilst the footprint of the dwelling would increase overall, the development would involve a stepping in at ground floor level of the existing single storey garage/living area element, albeit that there would be a mainly two storey element replacing it.
6. The proposed development would bring significant new bulk and massing at the rear of the property. The hipped roof would be extended to a gable roof and a large rear dormer with two windows including a Juliette balcony would be constructed in the rear roof slope. There would be a mainly two storey element at the western side which would extend beyond the main rear

elevation in a two storey form and so partly with a flat roof. That two storey element would effectively wrap around the rear so that there was a partial two storey element at the rear with a flat roof, leaving a single storey element adjacent to the common boundary with no.52. There would also be a single storey rear extension which would project deeper into the rear garden. From the west, there would be the flat roof of the dormer, stepping down to the flat roof of a two storey element, stepping down to the flat roof of a protruding single storey rear extension.

7. Considered cumulatively, the proposal would overwhelm the existing character of this semi-detached dwelling resulting in a serious loss of character for the host dwelling. Whilst the gable roof form proposed for the two storey side extension would be lower than the main roof ridge and would be a sympathetic shape, the cumulative bulk and massing and the box-like forms of the rear/side extensions and the prominent fenestration would bring an appearance of overdevelopment to the host and the surrounding area. The available land at the rear of the plot is not overgenerous and the resulting development would appear squeezed in. The south east corner of the proposed single storey rear extension would be close to the common boundary with no.52 leaving an almost enclosed wedge of land by the common boundary. The bulk and massing of the proposal would, from the rear, unbalance the appearance of the two semis together. This would exacerbate the disproportionality of the extensions at the appeal site.
8. Overall, the scheme is not well-designed and the rear/side extensions when viewed from the rear would not appear subordinate to the dwelling as a whole. I do not consider that a planning condition to control the external finishes of the extensions would result in the extensions sufficiently assimilating with the host dwelling or the local context to render the proposal acceptable.
9. In coming to my decision, I have borne in mind, amongst other things, the benefits which flow from having additional living space in the dwelling and the need to make effective use of land, however, those factors do not outweigh the harm I have identified above. I do not agree with the appellant that the demolition of the side extension would provide relief to the occupants of no.48 from a greater set back from the common boundary because the replacement element would be two storeys in height and protrude significantly deeper into the rear garden of the appeal site.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would be contrary to policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 and Supplementary Planning Document no.4 *Design of Residential Extensions* (2006).

Conclusion

11. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector