The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3252828
81 Carshalton Park Road, Carshalton, SM5 3SJ

- 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 Moore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
- The application Ref DM2020/00018 dated 11 December 2019 was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
- The development proposed is the conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, a dormer extension at rear and rooflights to front roofslope.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, a dormer extension at rear and rooflights to front roofslope at 81 Carshalton Park Road, Carshalton, SM5 3SJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2020/00018, dated 11 December 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: Location Plan, Existing Ground Floor Plan (Dwg No: S12389/1), Existing First Floor Plan (Dwg No: S12389/2), Proposed Joist Layout (Dwg No: S12389/3), Proposed Loft Room Plan (Dwg No: S12389/4), Sections (Dwg No: S12389/5), Existing Elevations (Dwg No: S12389/6), Proposed Elevations (Dwg No: S12389/7).

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the description of the development from the refusal notice as I consider this more fully describes the proposal.

3. Although reference has been made to permitted development rights, it has not been disputed by the Appellant that the appeal application requires planning permission and a planning application was submitted to the Local Planning Authority. This appeal follows the refusal of permission and I can confirm that I have considered it on its own merits.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is situated in a predominantly residential area that comprises mainly of semi-detached and detached properties. A wide range of styles and designs of properties can be found in the locality, which include hipped and gable roof forms, projecting front bay windows of differing types and variation in materials. The buildings are positioned so they are closely spaced, limiting views to the rear. The set back of properties from the road, many with vegetation and planting in front gardens, as well as the presence of mature street trees, contribute to the pleasant residential character of the area.

6. The proposal seeks permission for alterations to the roof line, a rear dormer extension as well as front rooflights. The proposed rear dormer would extend the width of the existing dormer and the existing roofline would also be extended to the north.

7. The property has been variously extended previously as the Council have set out and this appeal development would add further bulk to the dwelling. However, the property currently has a dormer, and despite the appeal development adding further mass, the extended dormer would still be set down from the ridge and back from the eaves. This would ensure that it would be seen within an appreciable section of the extended roof. Most of the previous additions referenced, have been identified as ground or first floor extensions other than the loft conversion involving a rear dormer. As such, I do not consider that the proposed additions at roof level would represent a disproportionate scale of development or appear to be overly dominant on the property.

8. Reference has been made to the detailed design of the proposal, but from the submitted plans, I can see that the windows in the dormer would broadly align with the two first floor windows below it. The extended roof line would be seen from the front, but as I saw at the time of my visit, and confirmed in the Council's Report on the appeal application, the roof forms along Carshalton Park Road are inconsistent and there is much variation in the built form of properties in the area. The extended roof line would not therefore appear unsympathetic on the host property or cause adverse harm to the character and appearance of the area. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the three proposed front roof lights and given their size and positioning within the roof slope, I have no reason to disagree with this position.

9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area and would not be contrary to Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan, which requires, amongst other matters, development which responds to local character. There would also be no conflict with the Supplementary Planning Document 'Design of Residential Extensions' which seeks, amongst other matters, design that is in sympathy with the appearance of the original dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

11. In addition to a condition relating to the commencement of development, a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt. A condition requiring matching materials is also required in order to ensure that the appeal development would have an acceptable appearance.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR