



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3232498
48 Manor Road, Cheam SM2 7AG

- 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 Kashif Burney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/00547, dated 26 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing side and rear structure and construction of a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an existing side and rear structure and construction of a single storey side and rear extension at 48 Manor Road, Cheam SM2 7AG in accordance with the terms of application ref. DM2019/00547, dated 26 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2019/0303-P07 Rev A, 2019/0303-P08, 2019/0303-P09, 2019/0303-P10, 2019/0303-P11 Rev A, and 2019/0303-P12 Rev A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locality including the Burton estates Area of Special Local Character; and,
 - The effect of development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 46 Manor Road, having particular regard to outlook and enclosure.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The immediate area is characterised by individually designed interwar period detached houses with simple form and common Arts and Crafts styled detailing. The properties are set within generally large and well landscaped plots presenting an open feel within the street scene. No 48 is a two-storey extended detached dwelling situated within one of the wider plots on Manor Road.
4. The proposed extension would replace a previous side addition that, like many others in the vicinity, results in the dwelling almost filling the plot width. Whilst the front face of the proposal would extend slightly further forward than the development to be removed, it would have a narrower profile and lower visible roof height. This would appear as a subsidiary side extension with a reduced and consolidated roof form and retain a frontal set back. The offsetting from the side boundary along with the reduced height and smaller front face would enhance the visual separation between no.48 and the neighbouring property at no.46.
5. Furthermore, as a replacement extension with additional floorspace substantially contained to the rear, views of the development would be restricted. The proposed step-in of the northern elevation and diminishing roof height would have a reduced presence in the streetscape compared to the existing development. This would decrease any public perception as to the degree of extension of the original building and would not, therefore, appear overly dominant or disproportionate.
6. Whilst the resultant depth of development would not be insignificant, given the size of the plot, it would neither undermine the prevailing local pattern or character of development. It was notable that other examples of large side and rear additions of various forms extend deep into the plot depths within the surrounding area. Notwithstanding that the appeal plot is shorter than others in the vicinity, the development would maintain the general scale and architectural style of development here without undermining the historic importance, openness or landscape qualities of the wider locality. It would therefore have, at worst, a neutral impact on the Burton Estates Area of Special Local Character.
7. Given the above, the proposed development is consistent with policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (Feb 2018) (LP) that, amongst other aims, seek to protect local context and character, and ensure that the form, scale, layout and details of developments respect and enhance the character of the townscape.

Living conditions of occupiers at 46 Manor Road.

8. With no window openings present in the side elevation of the nearest neighbouring property at no.46 Manor Road, the impact on outlook is limited to rear-facing windows and the garden area of that property. The proposed extension would extend about 4 metres rearward of a single-storey garage and store to the side of no.46. Notwithstanding the increased distance of

development from the common boundary, the proposed extension would be visible from some rear windows and within the garden of no.46.

9. However, views from the nearest ground floor habitable room windows would be substantially restricted as a consequence of the intervening garage at no.46. Whilst the extension would be visible from other windows and the garden area, the combination of the proposed offset distance; the relatively low eaves level above the height of the boundary fencing; and, the hipped roof form pitching away from the boundary, would ensure it would not be so close or sufficiently large to dominate the wide outlook obtained from those aspects.
10. For the same reasons, and that the common boundary already has a high screen of topped conifer hedging that may or may not be partially removed, the extension would not materially impact any sense of enclosure within the adjacent property. The neighbouring site benefits from a large garden with a wide panoramic view across long boundaries and the areas beyond. The relatively short additional length of development and removal of the existing more imposing roof would not significantly increase the sense of enclosure currently experienced within that site. Any effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers as a consequence of enclosure would subsequently be negligible.
11. The proposed development would therefore comply with policy 29 of the LP that seeks to protect local amenity including, amongst other things, the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook and sense of enclosure.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance in terms of the use of planning conditions. A condition relating to the development being carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching external surfaces is necessary and reasonable in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR