



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/23/3326221

87 St. Clair Drive, Worcester Park KT4 8UE

- 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 M Douglas McGowan against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2023/00517, dated 31 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 16 November 2023.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single-storey rear extension at 87 St. Clair Drive, Worcester Park KT4 8UE in accordance with the terms of the application, DM2023/00517, dated 31 March 2023 subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of the decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: SC-R00-EX-101, SC-R00-PR-101, SC-R00-EX-102, SC-R00-PR-102, SC-R00-EX-103, SC-R00-PR-103 and SC-R00-PR-106.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the: -
 - 1) character and appearance of the area and the host property; and
 - 2) living conditions of the occupiers of No.85 St Clair Drive.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No.87 is a detached bungalow sited to the western side of St. Clair Drive which comprises a mixture of single and two-storey properties. The proposal increases the depth of the whole building, extending the ridgeline to the rear.

There would be no increase in the height or width of the property and the extension in part replaces an existing rear projection.

4. I do not find that the scale of the extension would be overly disproportionate to the property, and a relatively lengthy rear garden would remain. Whilst additional bulk would be added at roof level, the form and overall character of the property would be retained and its relationship with the street would be unchanged. Even with the extension the appeal property would be relatively modest, particularly in height compared to the neighbouring two-storey property, and many of the bungalows along St.Clair Drive have been altered to create a first floor.
5. The extension would not have a subservience, but the continuous design approach and the materials reflect the existing property, and in my view, there would be assimilation with the host property and the wider locality. I therefore find that the proposal would accord with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (SLP) which requires that new development exhibits a high quality of design and respects the character of the area.

Living Conditions

6. The neighbouring properties have a typical side-by-side residential relationship. The two-storey form of No.85 currently extends further back than the appeal property. The extension would not project substantially beyond the neighbour's rear elevation and the overall depth would be less than its conservatory sited to the other side.
7. Following the existing form, the extension is designed with a pitched roof which would slope down to, but would be offset from, the shared boundary. The existing window in the side elevation of No.85 is a small high-level secondary window and aligns with the appeal property's existing flank elevation. Through the increased massing, and sited to the south, there would be some change in the shadow cast by the appeal property. However, in my view, the extension is not of a scale or proximity which would have an overbearing impact. It would not materially alter the outlook from the neighbour's main ground floor window and there is no specific evidence to suggest that there would be a material loss of light. I therefore find that the development would accord with Policy 29 of the SLP which seeks to protect amenity.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. Conditions are necessary in the interests of compliance with statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and certainty in relation to the plans. In the interests of the appearance of the property and the character of the area, it is necessary to secure the external materials to match the host property.
9. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR