

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/17/3174996

13 Woodbury Drive, Sutton, Surrey SM2 5RA

- 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 and Mrs I Trimnell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref B2016/75837/HHA was refused by notice dated 22 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a revised roof arrangement – a hip to gable roof with a Suffolk hip and pitched roof gable dormers to the front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a revised roof arrangement – a hip to gable roof with a Suffolk hip and pitched roof gable dormers to the front and rear in accordance with the terms of the application Ref B2016/75837/HHA, dated 21 December 2016, 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: 1:500 scale site plan and AL/1413/2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the walls and roofs of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all side facing first floor windows have been fitted with obscured glazing. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the bungalow and this part of Woodbury Drive.

Reasons

3. Woodbury Drive is a leafy residential street of hipped roof houses and bungalows. The buildings here are of varied design but are in general well-proportioned and detailed, creating a harmonious street scene. No 13 is a wide-fronted detached chalet bungalow, set back from the street. It has some
-

limited first floor accommodation lit in part by a small dormer window at the front and another at the back. The proposal would enlarge the first floor by changing the hipped roof ends to half-hips, replacing the existing dormer windows with 3 new ones at the front and 2 at the back and inserting new roof lights and side facing windows.

4. The Council does not appear to be concerned about the proposed new half hips. Although I saw no other such roofs on my site visit, this element of the proposal would not be out of keeping with the general design ethos of the area, which stems from a mix of well-crafted details.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Design of Residential Extensions* (SPD4) advises that front dormers will be resisted where they are not a characteristic of the area. In this case, dormer windows are an established part of the local street scene, whether used in cat-slide roofs or, as at No 13, in the main roof. The proposed front dormers would be well designed and reasonable in scale, set well up from the eaves and down from the ridge. Although they would take up just over 1/3 of the width of the roof, in conflict with the advice in SPD4, they would occupy a much smaller proportion of the overall roof slope so that their visual impact would be modest.
6. SPD4 also advises that dormers should align or relate to the windows below or create visual balance. In this case, the proposed dormers would not be fully in line with the windows below, but their regular spacing on the roof as proposed would achieve a better balance than would a slavish alignment with the irregularly set out ground floor windows.
7. The proposed dormer windows at the back would be substantially larger, but would still sit comfortably within the overall roof slope. They would be little seen from the street, if at all.
8. I conclude that the proposal has been designed to fit in well with the local architecture and street scene. It would not harm the character or appearance of the bungalow or this part of Woodbury Avenue. It therefore accords with the aims of Policy BP12 of the Core Planning Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Site Development Policies Development Plan Document and SPD4, to ensure that development including house extensions respects local context and distinctive local character.
9. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and another requiring the use of matching materials (excepting windows and doors which are proposed to be of different materials) to protect local character and appearance. A further condition is also required to ensure that obscure glazing is used for side facing first floor windows as detailed on the approved plans and referenced in the Grounds of Appeal, to protect neighbours' privacy.
10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR