
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2019

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3233049

10 Jubilee Road, Cheam SM3 8DJ

- 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 R Nagle against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/00442, dated 12 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear addition. Replacement outbuilding. Increase width of existing rear dormer. New dormer over rear annex. Provision for 3no roof lights of conservation style to front roof plane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear addition, replacement outbuilding, increase width of existing rear dormer, new dormer over rear annex, provision for 3no roof lights of conservation style to front roof plane at 10 Jubilee Road, Cheam SM3 8DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2019/00442, dated 12 March 2019, subject to the conditions set out below;
 - 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: Drawings No 1826-1; 1826-2; 1826-3; 1826-4; 1826-5; 1826-6; 1826-7A; and 1826-10.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the application form. Although different to that on the decision notice and the appeal form, no details have been provided to indicate any change was agreed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Cheam Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the CA. As such I have had regard to the duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. For the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), the CA is a designated heritage asset.
5. From my observations, I consider that the significance of the CA lies, in part, in the crossroads street pattern and its large commercial buildings, with verdant residential streets and the greenery of the park nearby. There is no uniform scale and appearance to the residential areas as a whole in the CA. However, there is a consistency within individual rows of properties, in particular to their front elevations. The terrace where the appeal site is located is an example of this and it makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
6. There is greater variation to the rear elevations of the row of properties in which the appeal site is located than the front. This includes several roof extensions. These are said to have been constructed prior to the road being included in the CA. Notwithstanding this, they form part of the existing character and context of the site.
7. The new dormer would add bulk to the outrigger roof and would not be set below the ridge level. Nonetheless, it would be above the eaves and would not cover the entire roof slope. It would be viewed with the enlarged dormer at the appeal property and as part of the existing varied rear roofscape of the terrace that includes dormers of a similar scale, design and position to that proposed in the appeal scheme. Public views of the new dormer would be limited and as with the existing roof extensions in the row, given the proximity of the outriggers to each other it would be partly screened in views from nearby properties and gardens. Therefore, it would not appear as a dominant feature.
8. The Council have not included refusal reasons for any other part of the proposal. Given that there are rooflights at the property already, the outbuilding would replace an existing one of a similar scale and position and the ground floor and dormer extensions are of an appropriate scale and appearance I have reached the same finding.
9. Therefore, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would comply with the design and conservation aims of Policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031, Supplementary Planning Document Design of Residential Extensions and the Framework.

Conditions

10. The standard time limit condition is imposed. In addition, I have imposed conditions requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty, and that external materials should match the existing property to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR