
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2016

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/16/3154687
46 Stafford Road, Wallington SM6 9AY

- 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 Argentum Bespoke Estates Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref D2016/74254/FUL, dated 27 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension, loft conversion with box dormer over rear roof slope and mansard roof over rear projection to create additional offices.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a loft conversion with box dormer over rear roof slope and mansard roof over rear projection to create additional offices.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey side extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 46 Stafford Road, Wallington SM6 9AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref D2016/74254/FUL, dated 27 April 2016 and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the single storey side extension: 442.1250.PL.01, 442.100.PL.01, 442.100.PL.02, 442.100.PL.03, 442.100.PL.04, 442.100.PL.05, 442.100.PL.06, 442.200.PL.01 and 442.200.PL.02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the single storey side extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located at the junction of Stafford Road and Elgin Road within a group of 3 pairs of 2 storey semi-detached buildings with substantial 2 storey rear projections. Due to its open corner position, the side of the appeal property is highly visible from both Elgin Road and from the junction with Stafford Road. During my site visit I noted that there did not appear to be any existing additions to the roof of the appeal property, the adjoining semi-detached property or others in the group.
5. The proposed box dormer over the rear roof slope and mansard roof over the rear projection would together form substantial additions to the roof of the appeal property which, in combination, would create a bulky and discordant feature and dominate the host building to an unacceptable degree.
6. Development in the surrounding area, including the car showroom to the north, is of varied form and design. However, the proposed box dormer and mansard roof would be read in the context of the group of semi-detached buildings within which the appeal property is located. The open, prominent nature of the appeal site would mean that this element of the proposed development would be highly visible and, due to its scale and design, would detract from the unified character and appearance of the group.
7. Other examples of roof forms and extensions in the area have been brought to my attention. However, I do not have full details of these schemes, their planning history or the individual site circumstances of each case. I have reached my conclusions on the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.
8. The appellant has referred to a recent planning permission for a development opposite the appeal site, which has not yet been implemented. I do not have full details of the scheme, but it would seem from the evidence before me that the proposal relates to the erection of a new building rather than the extension of an existing one. It would therefore appear that the circumstances of the scheme are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
9. I have had regard to the benefit of providing additional office space within the existing building and the resultant potential for job creation, and to the policy aims set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of delivering a strong, competitive economy and in Policy 4.2 of the London Plan in relation to office provision. I note that the Council have granted planning permission under application Ref D2016/74895/FUL for a revised scheme which would facilitate the conversion of the roof space within the appeal property. Based upon the evidence before me, the implementation of this revised scheme would provide additional office accommodation, in line with the economic policy aims of the Framework and London Plan, without the harm which I have identified would result from the appeal proposal.
10. It has been put to me that there were no objections or representations from neighbours in response to the planning application. However, the absence of objection does not render the appeal proposal acceptable, and I must determine the appeal with regard to the planning merits of the proposed development.

11. For the reasons set out above, the proposed loft conversion with box dormer over rear roof slope and mansard roof over rear projection to create additional offices would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Therefore, these elements of the appeal proposal would not accord with the design aims of the Framework, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the London Borough of Sutton Site Development Policies Development Plan Document (SDPDPD) and Sutton's Urban Design Guide: Creating Locally Distinctive Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
12. The proposed single storey side extension would be a modest addition to the appeal property. Its form and materials would be sympathetic to the existing building.
13. For these reasons, the single storey side extension would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Therefore, this element of the appeal proposal would accord with the design aims of the Framework, SDPDPD Policies DM1 and DM3 and the SPD.
14. Although the Council has referred to Policy PMP2 of the London Borough of Sutton Core Planning Strategy Development Plan Document, I do not consider it to be directly relevant to the appeal proposal because it relates primarily to development within Sutton's residential heartlands and the appeal site is located in a predominantly commercial area. Accordingly, I have given the policy little weight on this occasion.

Conditions

15. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition relating to materials.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to a loft conversion with box dormer over rear roof slope and mansard roof over rear projection to create additional offices, and allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey side extension.

CL Humphrey

INSPECTOR