



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3309736

19 Palmer Avenue, Cheam, Sutton SM3 8EF

- 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 and Ms P Gibson against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref: 22/00906, dated 12 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the *'demolition of existing detached garage at rear and erection of a part one, part two-storey side and rear extension. Conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, including creation of a crown roof to include a dormer extension to rear, installation of an upper floor window to flank wall and a window to rear roof slope and roof lights to side and rear roof slopes'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the *demolition of existing detached garage at rear and erection of a part one, part two-storey side and rear extension. Conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, including creation of a crown roof to include a dormer extension to rear, installation of an upper floor window to flank wall and a window to rear roof slope and roof lights to side and rear roof slopes* at 19 Palmer Avenue, Cheam, Sutton SM3 8EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00906, dated 12 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: E-1875-G-03/1A, E-1875-G-03/2A, 1875/G/0.0A, 1875/G/0.0, S-1875-G-01/1 and S-1875-G-01/2.
 - 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 development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Fire Safety Strategy – project No.1875.
 - 5) The flat roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used, all or in part, as a terrace or other amenity space. No railings, fences, walls, or other means of enclosure shall be erected on this flat roof, and no

alterations shall be carried out to the elevation of the application property to form access onto the roof.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal scheme includes various aspects. Planning permission has recently been granted for a large extent of the scheme including the alterations to the roof, dormer window and single-storey rear/side extension - Council Reference 2022/01520, which I will refer to as the extant scheme. My considerations, therefore, are primarily restricted to the first-floor side extension which is the element in dispute.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.19 is a semi-detached property reflective of the style of properties on the southwestern side of Palmer Avenue. These properties originally had a catslide roof to the side, although many have been altered with extensions or large side dormers to create further first-floor accommodation.
5. Both halves of the semi-detached pair (Nos.19 and 17) have a hipped roof to the side which extends off the central gable end, which previously formed the catslide. These alterations are fully integrated in terms of the property's appearance to the street, and it is a design of property which forms part of the prevailing character.
6. The proposed side extension would sit above a garage, which has consent under the extant scheme, and would align to the rear with the existing two-storey extension which it would become part of. The design would be sympathetic to the existing form and would be set some distance back from the front elevation with the roof set down further from the existing hip.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document - *Design of Residential Extensions* (SPD4) provides general guidance to assist with the approach to extending a property. It does indicate that proportionately extensions should be no wider than one-third to one-half of the width of the existing front elevation. The totality of the side extensions to the appeal property would exceed this measurement. However, the SPD also indicates that exceptions may occur where catslide roofs are a feature of the area, and the additional width proposed is modest in relation to the existing front elevation.
8. Whilst the Council refers to the loss of the catslide, this has already been established. Collectively, the various extensions and alterations to the appeal property would result in a significant increase in the floor area from the original dwelling. Nonetheless, the proposed side extension is designed to be subservient, it would appear proportionate and is reflective of the appearance of other extensions within the area which range in scale.
9. Spacing between the pairs of semi-detached properties is a characteristic of the area and there are examples, to the other side of the road, where this has been lost with terracing occurring. The proposal would, however, retain a gap at the first-floor level with the extension designed with a single-story element

up to the boundary. Additionally, due to the substantial setback it would not be a dominant feature and would have a very limited presence in the street scene.

10. As such, overall, I find that the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would accord with policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018, which amongst other things, requires new development to be of high design quality and to respect the local context.
11. While there would be some conflict with the guidance contained within SPD4, there would be compliance with the objectives for two-storey side extensions to be subordinate, in scale with the existing dwelling and to avoid a terracing effect, and thereby would reflect the aims of the guidance taken as a whole.

Conditions

12. Conditions are imposed to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and the plans in order to provide certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials of the approved development to match the existing property in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
13. A condition in relation to the provision of a fire strategy is necessary to ensure the development incorporates and maintains necessary fire safety measures and accords with the requirements of the London Plan.
14. The Council has also proposed a condition to prevent the use of the roof to the ground floor extension, which also forms part of this scheme, as a terrace. To ensure that the existing levels of privacy are maintained and for consistency with the extant scheme I have imposed the condition.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR