



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/25/3361561**

**16 Kingston Avenue, Sutton, Surrey SM3 9TZ**

- 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 & Mrs R Farrington against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
  - The application Ref is DM2024/00984.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing single storey extension and construction of a new two storey dwellinghouse.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are on:
  - (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and
  - (ii) whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to amenity space.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with single-storey side and rear additions and a full-width dormer within the rear roof slope. Its attached neighbour, 14 Kingston Avenue, includes a double-storey side extension with an expanded hipped roof. As a consequence of this addition the original symmetry of the pair of houses has been denuded. This is accentuated by the fact the pair of dwellings are set at an angle to the road and occupy a prominent corner location in the street scene next to the junction between Kingston Avenue and Chertsey Drive.
4. The surrounding area comprises streets of inter-war semi-detached houses and short terraces featuring hipped roofs and rendered frontages with half-timbering, bay windows and tile hanging. Many of these buildings retain their original symmetrical layout and appearance which is a key aspect of the character and appearance of the area and a matter to which I attach significant weight. I note that the spaces to the sides of many corner properties have been developed over the years to create 2-storey extensions and small dwellings. Some of these are detached houses with flank elevations set close to the pavement, whilst others,

such as the corner properties in the vicinity of the appeal site, are attached dwellings and extensions.

5. Planning permission for a dwelling at the appeal site was refused in 2023 and a subsequent appeal<sup>1</sup> was dismissed. I attach significant weight to my colleague's general observations in the consideration of the earlier appeal although the current proposal differs from the 2023 scheme and must therefore be considered on its individual merits.
6. The proposal would comprise the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and erection of a 2-storey, 3 bedroom detached house with a hipped roof. A long, largely blank flank elevation would be formed immediately next to the side boundary of the site and a car parking space would be provided within the rear garden.
7. Rather than reinforcing the original symmetry of the semi-detached pair the proposal would result in an uncomfortable juxtaposition between the host building and the new house. Whilst I recognise that the loss of openness on this corner site would not be incompatible with the pattern of the development in the wider area, due to its siting, form and massing the appeal proposal would be an incongruous element in this particular setting and would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.
8. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) which, amongst other matters, seeks new development that is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site.

#### *Living Conditions*

9. The proposal includes the provision of an off-street car parking space within the rear garden which would be accessed via a crossover in Chertsey Drive. This parking space would be centrally positioned and would occupy the full width of the garden thereby dividing the garden into 2 parts. Due to its layout, the outdoor space would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of future occupiers, which would to a degree be exacerbated by the high degree of shadowing next to the proposed house caused by the nearby street trees.
10. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) which states in the supporting text that private outside space should be practical in terms of its shape and utility.

#### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*S Poole*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/P5870/W/23/3325198