



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2021

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3284155

35 Claydon Drive, Bedlington, Croydon, CR0 4QX

- 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 Prashanth Govinda against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/01112, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed front extension and planning permission is granted for a front extension at 35 Claydon Drive, Bedlington, Croydon, CR0 4QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2021/01112/HSE, dated 27 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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, insofar as they relate to the front extensions hereby permitted: 2668/PL/01b, 2668/PL/02D and 2668/PL/03a
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the front extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene and the surrounding area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 33 and 37 Claydon Drive (No.33 and No.37), with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The curved highway, irregular shaped and sized plots, informal building lines and mixture of house designs and external materials all contribute to the informal character and appearance of this modern housing estate. The appeal

property comprises one of a pair of narrow detached houses with front projecting garages under shallow hipped roofs. These two dwellings occupy a recessed position between 31 Claydon Drive (No.31) and No.37. The appeal dwelling is also set back from the frontage of No.33.

4. Amongst other things Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 (LP) seeks to ensure that new development is designed to a high standard, respects local character and makes a positive contribution to the street frontage. The Sutton Supplementary Planning Document 4: The Design of Residential Extensions (SPD4) and Supplementary Planning Document 14: Creating Locally Distinctive Places (SPD14), are consistent with this. Together they advise that new development should respect the positive features of Sutton's suburban character. Extensions should be in keeping with the host dwelling and should not affect the character of the area. Front extensions should not over dominate the front elevation, or create visual imbalance.
5. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (The Framework) similarly seeks to ensure that new development is visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout and establishes or maintains a strong sense of place. At the same time development that is not well designed should be refused.
6. The proposed front extension would involve adding a first floor above the existing garage projection and extending forward the remainder of the front elevation, at ground floor level only, so that it would be in line with the front elevation of the garage. The first floor element of the front extension would have a hipped roof and the single storey element would have a flat roof hidden behind a front hip.
7. The proposed first floor element of the extension would respect the existing building lines and would project less than half way across the frontage of the dwelling. Its design would be in keeping with the existing projecting wing and its detailing, proportions and materials would all match those of the host dwelling. The single storey element of the extension would adhere to the design, height and proportions of the existing front porch and ground floor window.
8. The design and appearance of the overall front extension would be well balanced and would retain the essential characteristics of the front of the dwelling. It would appear as an integral part of the host dwelling and would complement the dwelling at No.33. In addition, the extension would break up the large expanses of brickwork on the side elevations of No.33 and No.37 when viewed from the street scene.
9. For these reasons the proposed front extension would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would be readily assimilated into the street scene. It would reinforce the prevailing characteristics and informality of the housing estate. This is subject to adherence to the submitted drawings and the use of matching external materials. As suggested by the Council this is something that could be secured through the imposition of conditions.
10. The proposed rear extension would stretch across the whole of the rear of the dwelling. The inner part of the extension would be two storeys high, with a flat roof and the outer section of the extension would be single storey with a flat roof. Each element of the extension would be some three metres deep and would project beyond the rear building lines of No.33 and No.37, as well as the

dwellings beyond them. The upper parts of its flank walls and first floor flat roof would intrude into the rear garden environment where they would appear unduly bulky, prominent, stark and utilitarian. It would also be totally out of keeping with the modest scale single storey rear extensions found within the rear garden environment.

11. For these reasons the rear extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This harm could not be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions. It would also outweigh the benefits for the appellant and their family that would result from the proposed additional accommodation.
12. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposed front extension would respect the host dwelling and the street scene and would therefore comply with LP Policy 28, SPD4, SP14 and The Framework. Conversely the proposed rear extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to the above policy and advice.

Living conditions

13. The proposed first floor element of the front extension would not project to the front of No.31. Whilst it would project to the front of an obscure glazed first floor bathroom window, this is not a habitable room and the gap between the two dwellings would be retained. The front extension would also project in front of the kitchen door in the side elevation, however this room also benefits from a large window facing towards the road.
14. The proposed single storey element of the front extension would project forward of a ground floor opening in the rear elevation of the dwelling at No.37. However, there is a good-sized gap between the two dwellings and there is already a tall fence along the boundary between the two houses.
15. For these reasons the proposed front extension would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos.33 & 37, due to visual impact, or loss of daylight/sunlight.
16. The proposed rear extension would project in excess of six metres beyond the rear elevations of the dwellings at Nos.33 & 37. As a consequence, the flank walls of the extension would be highly prominent above the boundary fencing, where they would have an enclosing and oppressive impact on the outlook from the adjacent rear windows and conservatories at Nos.33 & 37. This impact would be exacerbated by the stark and utilitarian appearance of the flank walls and flat roofs.
17. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposed front extension would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos.33 & 37 due to visual impact or loss of light. It would therefore comply with LP Policy 29 which seeks to ensure that new development does not adversely affect the living conditions of existing and future residents, due to visual impact. Conversely the rear extension would unacceptably harm the outlook from the rear of the dwellings at Nos.33 & 37, contrary to LP Policy 29.

Conclusion

18. Notwithstanding the overall conclusion on each of the main issues, in view of the acceptability of the front extension I have considered the possibility of issuing a split decision. As the two extensions are physically and functionally independent, this has been possible in this instance.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR