



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/25/3365965

Lime Cottage, 61 Upper Vernon Road, Sutton SM1 4NW

- 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 Yaogang Wang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Reference is DM2025/00017.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, increase to ridge height and a dormer extension to side.
-

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 host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey home with a fully hipped roof form and matching the property alongside; the homes having been erected in more recent years than most of the more traditional surrounds and generally being more modest in scale. The area is of established residential character, and the appeal property and its neighbouring dwelling add positively to this and the pleasing appearance of the locality. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The appeal scheme would lead to what I would deem as radical change to and expansion of the existing roof form. Unfortunately, the visual effect of the planned works would be a dwelling appearing to be strangely and uncomfortably 'top heavy' with a roof form that would be patently at odds architecturally and out of scale with the structure below. It would also appear negatively as markedly at variance from the dwelling alongside. Overall, the increased dwelling would look alien in the street and be jarring on the eye. Regrettably, it would stand out as a poorly designed property in a street which deserves better.
 5. Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan is relevant. Amongst other matters it seeks design of a high standard, with development being of a suitable scale and respecting local context. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to this policy. The Council's SPD4 'Design of Residential Extensions' (SPD) includes similar objectives. Whilst the SPD cannot be expected to cover every eventuality, I
-

conclude that there would be conflict with its aims in respect of safeguarding character and appearance.

Other matters

6. I do understand the wish to increase space within the home and I can see that careful consideration has been given to the selection of materials. Views of the property are limited but nevertheless I deem it important to protect the aesthetic qualities of this streetscene. I noted a small number of other works locally, and I have reviewed the London Road example specifically drawn to my attention. However, through positioning, form or scale, I found none in sum to be comparable to the case before me, which I must, in any event, assess on its own merits. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that a number of the schemes should be used as a benchmark for good design.
7. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant, but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character or appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR