



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2021

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/X/21/3274823

12 Link Road, Hackbridge, Sutton, Surrey SM6 7BB

- 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 Steven Malloy against the decision of London Borough of Sutton
 - The application Ref DM2021/00253, dated 08 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is for 'erection of front porch'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the 'erection of front porch' at 12 Link Road, Hackbridge, Sutton, Surrey SM6 7BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2021/00253, dated 08 February 2021.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form was "*planning consent for erection of front porch*". This description was amended following submission of the application to "*retention of front porch*". As 'retention' is not within the meaning of 'development' as set out within Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), I have utilised the original description. However, I have omitted the reference to 'consent' as the matter does not relate to an application within a 'consent' regime but to planning application.
3. The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. I am satisfied that the equivalent policies in the revised Framework have broadly the same approach as their counterparts, and they do not alter my conclusions on the matter in any case.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling situated in a predominantly residential street. The dwelling is set back from the road, within a mostly even building line along the street. The appeal scheme seeks retrospective planning permission for the introduction of a roof above the existing ground-floor bay

window, which extends across width of the front elevation to create an open porch above the front door.

6. The porch roof aligns with the projection of the bay and therefore does not interrupt the established building line to create an overly prominent feature within the streetscene.
7. The dwellings along the street are of the same type and design, creating a sense of uniformity. The majority of the dwellings have a projecting bay window, and several of these have some form of roof to the bay window, porch or extensions across the width of the dwelling to incorporate the bay, porch, and in some cases, an additional side extension. Given the prevalence of such extensions, the sense of uniformity in the streetscene is maintained. The appeal scheme reflects the scale and proportions of some of those extensions, though the appeal scheme is less massive given that it is mostly open. The appeal scheme is therefore in keeping with the character of the streetscene and the design and proportions of the host dwelling.
8. Whilst there may be no specific planning history record for these extensions, they nonetheless form part of the established character of the streetscene. In any case, some of the extensions may have been completed under permitted development rights, for which there would not necessarily be a planning record.
9. For these reasons, the appeal scheme complies with policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan, adopted 2018, policy H&BEP1 of the Hackbridge and Bedding Corner Neighbourhood Plan, made 2018, and related Supplementary Planning Guidance. These policies seek, amongst other things, high quality design which respects and responds to the setting of the site and townscape.

Conditions

10. As the development has already been carried out, it is not necessary to impose any conditions.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons stated above, I find that the scheme is in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole. The appeal is accordingly allowed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR