



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/17/3176328

22 Caledon Road, Wallington SM6 7HZ

- 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 & Mrs Cornick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref D2017/76255/HHA, dated 15 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Carshalton Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. Sited on a residential road within the CA, the site is a two storey mid terrace dwelling, featuring a slate roof, with parapet detailing and a two storey hipped roof rear outrigger with chimneys. It has retained many of its original external features and I find the property positively contributes to the CA. The Carshalton Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal (September 2007) (CAA) sets out that the significance of the conservation area is derived from its organic form of development, predominantly encompassed with high quality and well-maintained open parkland and ponds. Caledon Road was a later addition to the CA, and the CAA details that it contains several fine examples of Victorian architecture, with considerable detail given to the front elevations and little evidence of roof conversions.
4. The proposal seeks consent for two rear dormer extensions. The dormers would be constructed from zinc with standing seam detailing, having flat roofs and occupying much of the roof slope. Whilst being partially screened by 1 and 2 Butter Hill, I noted that the rear of the property is prominent and noticeable from other parts of Butter Hill and the Rose and Crown car park.
5. The Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 4 (October 2006) (SPD4) details large, flat-roofed, box-like dormers can have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of dwellings, the streetscene and neighbouring properties. Whilst being guidance only, I find that the combined scale

and flat roof box design of both dormers, even though separated by approximately 600mm, would result in a bulky, overly dominant and disproportionate addition. This impact would be further exaggerated by the dwelling's prominence at the rear.

6. Moreover, the design of the windows would relate poorly to the host dwelling; and whilst being the same width or narrower than the first floor windows, their height and glazing detail precludes them from having a vertical emphasis, a feature that is evident in the traditional sliding sash to the first floor rear bedroom. I note that zinc is a high quality material, which would introduce shadow lines and texture. However, this would not overcome the concerns I have with regard to the scale and window design of the dormers. I find that these elements combined are incongruous and would result in a harmful addition to the host dwelling and wider CA.
7. Consequently, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host dwelling or CA, and as such conflicts with Policies DM1, DM3 and DM4 of the Sutton Site Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2012). These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development maintains and enhances the local character and appearance of the surrounding area, contributes positively to the street scene and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of conservation areas. I also find conflict with SPD4 and Sutton's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Other Matters

8. During my site visit, I noted that there were other dormers within the street scene. However, I do not have the full details of each scheme before me and in any event, each proposal falls to be considered on its own particular merits and that is what I have done here.
9. I note the Council promotes and encourages a sustainable approach to building which would improve thermal performance; and I understand that the proposal would enable the appellants to insulate the roof and prevent water ingress, and provide additional accommodation for their family. Nevertheless, I do not find that this benefit to living conditions would outweigh the harm that I have found to the host dwelling and conservation area.

Conclusion

10. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. I find that the proposal would harm the significance of the CA, leading to 'less than substantial harm' as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm.
11. Having had regard to all other matters raised, and for the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR