



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3270837

11 The Ridge, Purley CR8 3PF

- 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 Atif Ahmed against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/01846, dated 10 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey side extension, a first-floor rear/infill extension, and a loft conversion with rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side extension, a first-floor rear/infill extension, and a loft conversion with rear dormers at 11 The Ridge, Purley CR8 3PF in accordance with the terms of application Ref DM2020/01846, dated 10 November 2020 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: XEVA/11TR/607, XEVA/11TR/608, XEVA/11TR/609, XEVA/11TR/614, XEVA/11TR/615, XEVA/11TR/618, and XEVA/11TR/621 (All Issue A).
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. Given the previous, now expired permission granted for development which was similar to that of the first-floor infill extension proposed in this appeal, the Council has raised no issue with this element of the proposal. The Council also finds no issue with the proposed single-storey side extension. There is no reason to disagree with the Council on these matters, and as such, this

recommendation will mainly focus on the development where it relates to the loft conversion with rear dormers.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the rear dormers on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located within 'The Ridge' Area of Special Local Character (ASLC), which is described in part as being characterised by properties with large front gardens, and in maintaining an abundance and variety of mature trees. The site lies on a corner plot, where Ridge Park meets The Ridge. The property itself, those to the east, and those beyond Ridge Park to the west, are all large, detached dwellings which are set back from the road. Though similar in these ways, the properties vary by way of exact size, form, and design. The appearance of No 11's roof is somewhat irregular. It accommodates three small dormers to the front, and a single dormer to the rear which would be replaced by the westernmost proposed dormer. A significant amount of vegetation is present between and amongst the houses, and this serves to soften and obscure the built form. Along the length of the site's perimeter which adjoins Ridge Park, No 11 maintains a tall, dense hedge, which is intermittently accompanied by well-developed trees situated alongside the pavement.
6. Though not entirely symmetrical, the two proposed dormers, together with the first-floor infill extension, would appear balanced. Both dormers would be set down from the lateral and longitudinal ridge of the existing roof, and would be separated by the central pitch of the roof as viewed from the rear. They would in this way avoid appearing as a single mass. The dormers would also be set in from the eaves, and from both flanks of the roof. This, together with the current overall scale of the building and the design of its roof, would allow for both dormers to appear sympathetic and subservient to the main dwelling and avoid appearing dominant. The resultant mass created by the dormers would not result in harm, and the dwelling's appearance would not be unduly conspicuous within its context.
7. In any case, views of the two dormers would be limited from the public realm. They would be partially visible from a confined aspect of Ridge Park, and incomplete, oblique views of one dormer would be present from the eastern approach of The Ridge. Given the above, neither perspective would introduce harm to the character and appearance of the area, and the aesthetic qualities of the ASLC as described in the Council's character appraisal would be conserved.
8. The Supplementary Planning Document SPD4 Design of Residential Extensions (SPD) provides guidance for roof extensions. It advises that the total width of all dormers should not exceed 1/3 of the overall roof width and that they should align or relate to the windows below or create visual balance. Though together at their widest point the dormers would exceed 1/3 of the overall roof width, their position amongst the three pitched elements of the roof at the rear and the general nature of the roof as a whole would allow the two dormers to avoid creating a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling. Similarly, though the dormer windows would not directly align with those below, they would otherwise relate sufficiently to the overall visual

balance of the fenestration at the rear and the built form of the property. Given this, even if the advice given in the SPD cannot be fully complied with, the dormers would successfully avoid harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling, and the surrounding area.

9. For these reasons, the rear dormers would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or the surrounding area, and would accord with Policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 which together seek to ensure development respects the local context, is of a suitable scale, and conserves or enhances Areas of Special Local Character.

Other Matters

10. The development would have an insignificant effect upon the green space currently present on the site, and the property would remain respectful to its surroundings with regard to its overall size and height. The plans provide a clear representation of the development proposed, and further drawings would in this case not be necessary. The site is not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the development has however been considered in the context of it being within an ASLC.
11. The Council have found no issues relating to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. This includes loss of light and overlooking, due to the distance present between properties. There is no reason to disagree with the Council on these matters, and as such the same views are reached in this recommendation.

Conditions

12. As standard, conditions relating to the commencement of the development and compliance with the plans, in order to provide certainty, are recommended. A condition ensuring the external materials match the existing building would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal is therefore seen to conform with the development plan as a whole. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR