



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3282734
81 The Drive, Wallington SM6 9ND

- 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 P Murphy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref: DM2021/01170 dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, three dormer extensions at rear and rooflights to front and flank roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, three dormer extensions at rear and rooflights to front and flank roofslope at 81 The Drive, Wallington SM6 9ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: DM2021/01170 dated 3 June 2021, 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: red line site location plan; block plan; 21/2337 8; 21/2337 9 A; 21/2337 12; 21/2337 13; 21/2337 14; 21/2337 10; 21/2337 11 A; 21/2337 15 A; 21/2337 1; 21/2337 2; 21/2337 3; 21/2337 4; 21/2337 5; 21/2337 6 A and 21/2337 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.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the rooflights at roof level in the east facing roof slope and the new landing window in the east facing elevation have been fitted with obscure glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room or landing space in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the windows shall be retained and maintained as installed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council amplified the description of development at the application stage to refer to *conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, three*

dormer extensions at rear and rooflights to front and flank roofslope. This description has been used at the appeal stage and as it more fully and accurately describes the full extent of the proposed development, I have also used it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing house and on the local area, including The Ridge Area of Special Local Character.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached property on the north side of The Drive overlooking an area of open space, within a predominantly residential area. The properties step down in height from west to east along this part of The Drive. It is also within The Ridge Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). Except in so far as the Council has described the ASLC in the Officer's report I have not been provided with any additional information in respect of the ASLC in terms of its extent and key features. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's description as set out in the report.
5. The proposal seeks to introduce accommodation at second floor level by increasing the ridge height and changing the existing hipped roof to an asymmetrical half hipped roof. There would be three dormers to the rear and two rooflights to the front and two more to one of the side elevations.
6. There is a general regularity in the roof forms in the immediate surrounding area albeit this varies more in the wider area. Although the ridge height would be increased, I am satisfied that there would still be a step down in height from west to east as shown on the submitted plans and as seen in street scene views. This would respect the relationship with the immediately adjoining properties and the street scene in this respect.
7. The proposed roof form would change the existing cross hipped roof to an asymmetrical part hipped roof. Whilst I agree with the Council that there do not appear to be examples of identical roof forms to the one proposed in the local area, the use of part hipped roofs in the immediate surrounding local area is found in a number of examples. This would assist the proposed roof form to be assimilated into the local context. The asymmetrical part hipped roof would also respond to the stepping down of the roof forms from west to east. Furthermore, the use of matching materials with the existing property would also ensure that the property would be in keeping with the local context.
8. The proposed dormers to the rear would be of an appropriate size, siting and design. They would be subordinate in scale to the size of the roof and well set in from the roof edges. They would therefore not be a dominant feature in relation to the existing scale and proportions of the property and in street scene views, including when approaching the property from east or west.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed roof works would respect and not materially harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area and the ASLC. This would accord with Policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other things, seek for a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. I agree that conditions should be imposed to require matching materials to respect the character and appearance of the existing building and of the local area. I shall impose a condition to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I agree with the Council that although shown on the plans, a condition should also be imposed to require the rooflights on the side, east facing roofslope and the landing window on the east facing side elevation to be in obscure glass and non-openable below a specified height to protect the amenities of the immediate neighbours.
11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR