



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/25/3359394

16 Stoneleigh Avenue, Worcester Park, Sutton KT4 8XX

- 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 Soyefuddin Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application ref. DM2024/01209.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side extension, alteration to the first floor flank roof from flat to pitched and alteration of the ground floor rear roof from flat to pitched.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the box heading above I have used the fuller description of the proposed development taken from the Council's Notice of Decision rather than the shorter description on the appellant's application form. This does not prejudice the appellant.

Main Issue

3. 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

4. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the west side of Stoneleigh Avenue in the mainly residential area known as Worcester Park. It is an attractive Avenue with some street trees. The dwelling's semi-pair is 14 Stoneleigh Avenue and it is located to the north. The Avenue is orientated approximately north/south and is a mixture of semi-detached and terraced properties.
5. The appeal site has a front forecourt area where vehicles can be parked off road. The dwelling to the south is 18 Stoneleigh Avenue and this is semi-detached with no.20 its semi-pair to its south. There are mutual private partial views of the rear of nearby dwellings from the rear gardens of nearby properties.
6. The appeal site has an existing side extension to the south of its main southern flank. That extension has a flat roof. There is a single storey ground floor front extension with a mono pitch roof which extends partly over the side extension ground floor frontage and has two front doors. The rear roof slope has a flat-roofed dormer with two windows. A full width ground floor rear extension has been constructed which does not appear to be in accordance with the

existing rear elevation drawing submitted with the planning application which is the subject of this appeal. However, nothing in particular turns on that.

7. The existing two storey side extension touches the two storey flank extension wall of no.18. That element of no.18 has a pitched roof and higher eaves than the extension at the appeal site. The side extension at the appeal site sits slightly forward of the main front elevation of no.18. The proposed development would include, amongst other things, extending at first floor level at the rear flush with the main rear wall and erecting a pitched roof over the altered side extension.
8. Supplementary Planning Document 4 on the *Design of Residential Extensions* advises that the design of any extension should always be in sympathy with the appearance of the original dwelling. It is also the intention of that Document that where gaps between dwellings are characteristic of a street then where extensions close this gap and visual crowding occurs, proposals will be resisted.
9. There are typically visual gaps between the dwellings and terraces at first floor level along Stoneleigh Avenue. These delineate the dwelling groups and give a reasonable degree of openness and rhythm to the Avenue. Whilst the gap at first floor level between nos 16 and 18 has been reduced by first floor development, the increase in built development of a pitched roof would reduce that gap further. Visually, that would result in a large expanse of development that would be detrimental to the appearance and character of the streetscene and surrounding area. The lack of set back at the first floor level in conjunction with the proposed pitched roof form would exacerbate the prominence of the proposal to the detriment of the relationship between the site, the nearby dwellings and the surrounding area. Overall, the side addition would not appear subordinate to the main house.
10. In coming to that view, I have weighed up the design benefits to the host dwelling of the proposed pitched roof on the side addition as that design would, to my mind, be an improvement to the flat roof. However, I consider this to be clearly outweighed by the loss of the visual gap at roof level and the failure of the side addition to appear subordinate to the main dwelling.
11. From the rear, the proposed pitched roof on the altered two storey side addition would also close down the visual gap and would lead to an appearance from the rear of an unduly overdeveloped plot. Again, the change from a flat roof on the side addition could, if considered entirely on its own, be a benefit in design terms, but this would be clearly outweighed by the resulting overdeveloped appearance from the rear and a failure of the side addition to appear subordinate to the main dwelling.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would unduly 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 (adopted 2018) and the Supplementary Planning Document 4 'Design of Residential Extensions' (2006).

Conclusion

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

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector