



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: 25th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3285271
19 Bawtree Close, Sutton SM2 5LQ

- 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 Mrs J Luckins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref: DM2021/00769 dated 2 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension to side; single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension to side; single storey extension to rear at 19 Bawtree Close, Sutton, SM2 5LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: DM2021/00769 dated 2 April 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: OS Location Plan; DM2021/ 00769 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans; DM2021/ 00769 Existing Elevations (Rear and Front); DM2021/ 00769 Existing Plans; DM2021/ 00769 Proposed Plans and DM2021/ 00769 Proposed Elevations.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the existing property, the semi-detached pair and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached residential property at the south eastern corner of a no-through road with a number of different styles of properties, most being short terraces with forward projecting garages. There are a small number of semi-detached pairs, including the appeal property but its style and design is distinct from the other properties. The semi-detached

- pair are wide in form and given their siting in relation to the surrounding dwellings, the semi-detached pair are not visually dominant in the street scene.
4. The proposed extensions would individually and together be modest in scale comprising a first floor extension over part of the existing garage to the side and a single storey rear extension. The Council has raised no concern with the rear extension and given its small scale and design and siting, I have no reason to take a different view.
 5. The side extension would be limited in width taken on its own and compared with the width of the existing property. It would not be set back from the front building line and the roof line would continue the existing roof ridge and would not be set down. However, given the small scale of the side extension, I consider that this would be an appropriate design response, and would enable the proposed extension to integrate with the unadorned and regular, flush form of the existing property. I therefore consider that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing property.
 6. The existing semi-detached pair are not identical as existing, particularly in terms of the siting of the garages and the extension would increase the difference. However, given the siting of the pair and the small scale of the extension proposed I do not consider that this would upset the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair or of the local area. As I have already indicated, the appeal property and its neighbour do not reflect the predominant style of development within Bawtree Close.
 7. I am also satisfied that given the siting in relation to the neighbour at No 17, the proposed extension would not materially affect the relationship and gap with that property. It would not therefore detract from the pattern of development within the local area.
 8. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the street scene. There would be no conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which seek a high quality of design which respects the local context. The Council has also referred to conflict with its SPD4 'Design of Residential Extensions' in the refusal notice but this has not been provided to me, and the Officer's report does not draw attention to any particular parts of SPD4 where it is considered that there would be a conflict.

Other Considerations

9. I have taken account of the concerns expressed by the neighbours at No 21 in respect of the single storey rear extension and have no reason to disagree with the responses provided by the Council at the application stage. Most of the matters raised are private matters or covered under other legislation and not by planning and a condition would be imposed to ensure that materials match the materials at the existing property.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. The Council has proposed a number of conditions in the event of planning permission being granted. I agree that the materials should match the existing materials to protect the character and appearance of the existing building and

the local area. A condition should be imposed to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

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