



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/22/3301930

41 and 43 Egham Crescent, North Cheam SM3 9AP

- 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 David Palmer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2022/00256, dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversions and raising of ridge height for both properties.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversions and raising of ridge height for both properties at 41 and 43 Egham Crescent, North Cheam, SM3 9AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2022/00256, dated 10 February 2022 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: Site Plan 001, Site Plan 002, CO/DP/01/B and CO/DP/02/C.
 - 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 effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area which is characterised by two storey semi-detached and terraced properties. A number of dwellings, both in Egham Crescent and other streets nearby, have loft conversions. Rear dormers and rooflights are therefore common features in the area, meaning that there is little consistency in terms of the roofscape.
4. No's. 41 and 43 form the middle properties of a terrace of four. The proposed development would result in the ridge heights of the two properties being raised above those of the dwellings either side. However, the increase in height would be modest, and the appearance would not be incongruous or out of

keeping with the surrounding area given that several terraces or pairs of semi-detached houses nearby already have inconsistent ridge heights.

5. In some instances, the difference in ridge heights are caused by the gently sloping topography of the area. However, the appearance is still very similar to what is being proposed at No's. 41 and 43. Indeed, in this instance, the increase in ridge heights on the two central dwellings would maintain an element of symmetry and rhythm across the four properties when viewed from the road. In addition, the presence of four proposed rooflights on the front of the roofs would not detract from the street scene or look out of place given that there are examples of other such details in the vicinity.
6. The proposed dormers to the rear of No's. 41 and 43 would be similar in design to others in the immediate surrounds. While the tops of the two dormers would be marginally higher than the ridge heights of No's 39 and 45 either side, there would only be glimpsed views at most from the street due to the location of the existing chimney stacks. From the rear, the two dormers would not appear overly large or dominate the neighbouring properties either side, particularly as they are set in from the flanks of the two host dwellings. Their appearance would also not look unusual given that other similar dormers are clearly visible from the rear gardens of No's. 41 and 43.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is therefore in accordance with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2016-2031), Policy D4 of The London Plan (March 2021) and Supplementary Planning Document 4, Design of Residential Extensions, which taken together, permit development that preserves existing character and is of good design.

Conditions

8. In the interests of certainty and clarity, I have imposed the standard time condition and identified the relevant plans. I have also imposed a condition on materials to ensure that the proposed development conforms with the existing character of the two properties and the wider area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR