



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: 03 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/25/3371841

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 Mrs Lisa Watts against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2025/00699
 - The development proposed is the erection of an outbuilding to provide annexe accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed outbuilding 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. Park Hill Road lies within an Area of Special Local Value (ASLV). The main house 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 proposed development would involve the demolition of the garage and shed and the construction of a single-storey outbuilding, to be used as a residential annexe, on the combined site of the two structures, with a footprint totalling around 48 sq metres, based upon submitted drawings.
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 ASLCs, will be expected to conserve and, where practicable, enhance its significance. The Council expects new development to integrate 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 contends that the proposed annexe would increase the built form within the frontage beyond what would be expected of an ancillary outbuilding, and which would appear incongruous within the streetscene, at odds with the prevailing pattern of development. As a result the annexe would appear overly dominant and visually intrusive within the streetscene.
7. The situation of the appeal property on a corner plot means that it is prominent within the street scene both from the front and the side. To the side boundary there is a thick 2 metre high hedge that currently blocks any view of the shed and allows a clear view only of the roof of the garage which is over 3 metres away from the boundary and has a pitched roof slanting away from the boundary. The proposed outbuilding would have a gable end, rising to around 3.8 metres high to the roof ridge and which would be within 1 metre of the boundary. To have such a prominent and readily visible structure so close to the boundary with the highway would be out of character with the surrounding area and would not conserve or enhance its key elements, which include a sense of openness and apparent space between buildings and their property boundaries with the highway.
8. The residential annexe would have a footprint of around 48 sq metres, and would include a large kitchen/living area; a bedroom, which is shown as being of a size to accommodate a double bed; and a wet room. It effectively would have a front door in the front elevation and patio doors to the rear, and pedestrian access would not, therefore, utilise the pathway between the house and the annexe. I acknowledge that the annexe would not compete with the scale of the main house, and that there would not be a physical boundary between it and the main house. Nevertheless, the annexe would have the scale, appearance and nature of a small bungalow, and would not respect the context of the surrounding pattern of development.
9. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) states that the annexe is intended for use by an elderly relative who requires support, but with a degree of independence. I sympathise with this desire, but this does not mean that the annexe should be totally independent and effectively served by its own front and back doors. The size of the annexe would appear to be excessively large for its purpose purely as ancillary accommodation and it gives the appearance of a wholly self-contained unit, with means of access largely unrelated to the main house. Finally, the appellant contends that a similar building could be constructed elsewhere within the curtilage using permitted development rights. This may be so, but I have based my consideration on the details of the current scheme, including its scale and position.
10. In conclusion, I consider that, in this case, the scale, internal arrangements, and nature of the proposed annexe would give the impression of a small bungalow beside the main house, which would not respect the context of the surrounding pattern of development. The significant increase in height resulting from the construction of the annexe in such close proximity to the side boundary of the property, would result in a building that would be much more prominent in the streetscene, and which would be uncharacteristic of the surrounding area. In the light of this, I find that the proposed annexe accommodation would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Park Hill Drive. It would conflict with Policies 28 and 30 of the LP and, accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR