



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/23/3329676

87 Claydon Drive, Beddington, Sutton, CR0 4QX

- 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 Onur Beziray against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2023/00756, dated 8 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single-storey ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single-storey ground floor extension at 87 Claydon Drive, Beddington, Sutton, CR0 4QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2023/00756, dated 8 May 2023, 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 and documents: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Drg Nos CD122022-BP, CD122022-01, CD122022-02, CD122022-03, CD122022-04, CD122022-05B, CD122022-06B, CD122022-07B, CD122022-08B, and the Fire Safety Statement.
 - 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 flat roof of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used, all or in part, as a terrace, balcony, roof garden or other similar amenity space.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling located within a residential cul-de-sac comprising properties of similar type and age. Claydon Drive is arranged in a loop with No 87 on the outside of its curve and part of a

cluster of four properties (Nos 81-87 odd) which share a single access drive. The appeal property is set perpendicular to Claydon Drive with an end gable facing the road. No 89 to one side has a more conventional frontage to Claydon Drive and is recessed behind the forward building line of the appeal property. No 85 to the opposite side shares a similar building line and orientation to No 89. There is a detached double garage within the curtilage of the appeal site which is recessed further still within the space between the front elevation of No 87 and the side elevation of No 85. No 87 currently has a lean-to conservatory to its rear facing, side gable. This would be replaced with a single-storey, flat roof extension with a dummy pitch which would span the full depth of the dwelling and which would extend into the property's rear garden by a distance of 7.5m, and which would overlap with and adjoin the side elevation of the existing garage.

4. Given the orientation of No 87, the proposed extension would technically comprise a side extension, despite its projection into the property's enclosed private rear garden. The Council's *Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document October 2006* (SPD) deals with single-storey side extensions at part A.1. In order to maintain the original character of the dwelling, the SPD advises that single-storey side extensions should normally, amongst other things, be read as a subordinate addition to the main dwelling, create a clear setback of 225mm from the front elevation, and be no wider than one-third to a half the width of the existing dwelling.
5. The extension would only be marginally set back from the front elevation of the building and would far exceed half-the width of the dwelling. If viewed in a conventional street scene, I would concur with the Council's assessment that the proposed extension would be likely to appear over-wide and dominant. However, due to the orientation, setting and layout of No 87, the extension would be largely undetected from the public domain.
6. When approaching the appeal site from the east, the extension would be screened from view by the siting and two-storey scale of the neighbouring property at No 89. I accept that it would be partially glimpsed in oblique views from Claydon Drive across the forecourts of Nos 81-87 when approaching from the opposite direction, but it would not be seen as conspicuous, and neither would its full depth be detected due to the screening position of the existing garage.
7. The Council is further critical of the physical link between the extension and the garage, arguing that the effect would be a wrap-around front and side projection to the original dwelling. Regardless, I am unable to detect any resulting harm. The garage would maintain its existing deeply recessed position and the extended building would merely display an 'L-shaped' footprint that would offer some enclosure to one far corner of the group of four. Given the irregular development pattern around Claydon Drive, where the placement of dwellings and associated outbuildings follows no regimented layout, I am satisfied that the proposal would detract neither from the character nor appearance of the dwelling, or with the street scene. As such, there would be no conflict with the aims and objectives of the SPD, or with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031, adopted in 2018, as far as it requires extensions to respect the local context and respond to local character.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the event I allow the appeal and having regard to advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. A condition specifying the relevant plans and documents with which the scheme should accord is necessary as this provides certainty. The condition I have imposed includes reference to the submitted Fire Safety Strategy, which formed part of the application proposal. This is necessary to ensure compliance with the requirement of Policy D12 of The London Plan for all development to achieve a high standard of fire safety.
9. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials that would match the existing. In order to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring occupiers, a condition is required to prevent the flat roof of the extension from being used as an outside amenity area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I find that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property, or to the surrounding area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR