



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2022

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13<sup>th</sup> April 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3283880**

**127 Marlow Drive, Cheam, Sutton SM3 9AS**

- 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 Clare Zaghir against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
  - The application Ref DM2021/01281, dated 18 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2021.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two storey front, side and rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part one, part two storey front, side and rear extension at 127 Marlow Drive, Cheam, Sutton SM3 9AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: DM2021/01281, dated 18 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: 1217 301, 1217 101 Rev 01, 1217 201 Rev 03 and 1217 202 Rev 03.
  - 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.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development at the application stage whilst there is no formal agreement to the change this description has been used at the appeal stage and as it more fully and accurately describes the proposed development, I have therefore used it in my decision.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

4. The residential area comprises semi-detached and terraced properties of a similar design with hipped roofs and bay windows. The two storey properties are set back from the road and No.127 occupies a corner plot with its side

- boundary extending along The Meads. The existing single storey side projection and rear conservatory would be replaced with a two-storey side extension and single storey wrap around element creating a rear extension and porch.
5. The Council's position is that the proposal would be excessive in width and dominant in the street scene, breaching the advice in their Supplementary Planning Documents -SPD 4: The Design of Residential Extensions (SPD4) and SPD 14: Creating Locally Distinctive Places (SPD14).
  6. Within the locality, as I observed on my site visit, many of the corner properties have two storey side extensions up to the side boundary. This includes a recent extension to No.105 Marlow Drive, as referenced by the appellant, which is a short distance from the appeal site at the next road junction. Additionally, No.17 The Mead on the opposite corner has the same form of extension and effectively has the same relationship with Marlow Drive as the appeal proposal would have with The Mead. Thereby, whilst I accept that some of the extensions predate the SPDs, they inform the context and are an established part of the character of the area.
  7. The appeal property occupies a spacious position, the adjoining roads with pavements to both sides are relatively wide and No.14 The Meads is some distance to the rear. The single storey element adjoining the side boundary would have a mono pitched roof with the eaves a limited distance above the boundary fencing. The extension would also project forward of the front elevation, however No.127 already has a projecting porch, and the design is reflective of features to other properties found in the vicinity. As such, I do not find it would be an incongruous feature or have an overbearing impact.
  8. The two-storey extension would be just over 50% of the width of the original property and thereby exceeds the recommendation in SPD4. However, as set out in the guidance these recommendations are *general rules of thumb*, and the proposal follows the advice for a subordinate approach with the two storey extension designed to be set down and inset. The materials and roof pitch would match with the original property and in my opinion the extension would have a sympathetic appearance. In the wider context the scale and form of the proposal reflects the prevailing pattern of development and would not be overly dominant in either the Marlow Drive or The Mead street scenes. Thereby I find that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the area and accords with the overall aims of the guidance in the SPDs.
  9. Thus, the proposal is compliant with Sutton Local Plan (2018) policy 28 and SPD4 and SPD14 guidance, as a whole, which collectively seek development which is of high quality design and respects the local context.

### **Conditions and Conclusion**

10. I have imposed the standard condition allowing 3 years to commence development and a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. A condition is also required regarding external materials to protect the character and appearance of the area.
11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR