



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: 08 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3272538

2 Brocks Drive, Cheam, Sutton SM3 9UJ.

- 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 D Moss against the decision of London Borough of Sutton
 - The application Ref DM2021/00159, dated 28 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, hip to gable with a dormer extension at rear and rooflights to front roofslope'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description.
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.

Application for Costs

4. An application for costs was made Mr D Moss against London Borough of Sutton. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site a semi-detached dwelling located at the junction of Brocks Drive with Gander Green Lane. The appeal scheme seeks to create residential accommodation in the roofspace of the host dwelling. To achieve this, a hip-to-gable extension would replace the original main hipped roof of the host dwelling and the flat roof of an existing two-storey side extension.
7. The pattern of development in the vicinity is regular and tight, with limited gaps between buildings along Brocks Drive. This pattern provides limited

opportunity for side extensions without creating an overdeveloped, cramped or terraced appearance. However, the appeal site flanks the rear gardens of properties in Gander Green Lane and, as a result, has more open surroundings than other dwellings in Brocks Drive. Consequently, the existing side extension does not interrupt the overall pattern of development by infilling a gap within the streetscene. The appeal scheme would not extend beyond the existing footprint of the side extension.

8. Nonetheless, Brocks Drive features little variance in the type, scale and overall design of dwellings, creating a strong uniform character. Whilst hip-to-gable extensions appear common in Gander Green Lane and other surrounding roads, they are not a common feature in Brocks Drive. Whilst a hip-to-gable extension of the original roof could potentially be achieved by exercising permitted development rights, the scheme seeks to extend over an existing side-extension as well. The resulting overall width and length of single roof line, coupled with the prominent additional mass at roof level would create an imbalanced appearance across the semi-detached pair and would not appear subordinate to the main dwelling. Moreover, the roof-form would be out of keeping with the predominant modest hipped roof character of Brocks Drive.
9. Whilst flat roof-forms are sometimes regrettable design choices, the existing roof form does emphasise the subservience of the two-storey extension and limit its overall mass. The appeal scheme would therefore not offer an improvement in this regard.
10. I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits. The Appellant has referred to other examples of development in the wider vicinity, though none have the same built context and they are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme.
11. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would fail to respond the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan, adopted 2018, as well as the principles contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high standard of design which respects the local context and responds to local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR