



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2025

by J D Westbrook BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/25/3371845

84 Park Hill Road, Wallington, SM6 0RQ

- 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 Mark Watts against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2025/00830
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, a dormer extension at rear and rooflights to front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of Park Hill Road.

Reasons

3. No 84 is a large, wide-fronted semi-detached house, situated within a corner plot at the southern end of Park Hill Road, at a point where it turns to the west. It currently has a hipped roof, with a large front gable and a bay window on the front elevation. It has a conservatory and small, single-storey extension to the rear, and a detached garage and shed to the side of the house. The proposal would involve the alteration of the hipped element of the roof to a small half-hip; the construction of a large, flat-roofed rear dormer; and the insertion of rooflights into the front roof slope.
4. Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (LP) indicates that the Council will grant planning permission for new development, including extensions, provided the new development is attractive and designed to the highest standard; respects the local context and responds to local character; and is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site and/or townscape.
5. Policy 30 of the LP indicates that development which has an impact upon a heritage asset, including Areas of Special Local Character (ASLC), will be expected to conserve and, where practicable, enhance its significance. The Council will expect that new development integrates into the historic environment, and will expect that development within an ASLC conserves and, where practicable, enhances those elements which contribute to its particular character or appearance.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions (SPD) gives guidance on roof extensions. It indicates that large, flat-roofed, box-like dormers can have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of dwellings, causing detriment to the streetscene and neighbouring properties. This includes dormers added to rear roof slopes, especially those visible from the street. In addition, to achieve a good design it is necessary to pay particular attention to the size and form of the roof, and the arrangement and proportion of existing windows. Design criteria include that the front of the dormer should be set back behind the line of the main elevation; that windows should align or relate to the windows below or create visual balance; that the dormer should be set below the ridge and away from the hip to avoid visual crowding, and that it should not cover the entire roof slope.
7. The Council contends that the proposed development, due to the shape of the new roof and excessive width of the dormer, would appear large, flat-roofed, box-like and top heavy, to the detriment of the semi-detached pair, streetscene and Park Hill Road ASLC.
8. The situation of the house on a corner plot means that it is prominent within the street scene both from the front and the side. The rear of the building is also clearly visible from the public realm. The proposed dormer would be a large, dominant feature at the rear of the house, extending across much of the widened rear roof slope. It would be set a small amount behind the eaves line and a small amount below the roof ridge, but would still occupy a large percentage of the rear roof slope and would be a dominant feature when viewed from the road to the south. It would include two large windows with Juliet balconies and a third, smaller window between. The windows would not align with, or relate to, the windows below and would not create visual balance. Along with the flat-roofed, box style dormer design itself, they would appear incongruous in the context of the design and appearance of both the rear elevation of the host property and also of nearby dwellings.
9. The character appraisal for the ASLC notes that the area has architectural features that adhere to Edwardian and the Arts and Crafts style. Proposed alterations to a property should preserve the character and appearance of the house, and the architectural interest of the property should be considered when undertaking extensions or alterations. With regard to roofs, including extensions, design guidance states that development should respect the original roof profile and form. In this case, the scale, design and features of the dormer extension would not adhere to the prevailing architectural style of the area and, in particular, would not respect the original roof profile and form of the host property.
10. In the light of the above, I find that the proposed rear dormer would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around the southern end of Park Hill Drive. It would conflict with Policies 28 and 30 of the LP, with guidance in the SPD, and with design principles outlined in the ASLC character appraisal. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR