



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2023

by S Lo LLB M.SRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/23/3318825

20A The Broadway, Sutton, Beddington CR0 4QR

- 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 C Jones of Maurice Laurent Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2022/01793.
 - The development proposed is described as a dormer extension in the rear roof slope and over the 2nd floor flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a three-story building in a row of shop frontages, with residential flats above. These buildings are broadly consistent in age and design, with some limited variation at the ground and first floor level at the rear elevation. However, from the second floor upwards, there is a cohesive and largely uniform appearance to the buildings, with an attractive, sweeping roof profile punctuated by parapets and stacks. No existing physical alterations were noted in the current roofline aside from the presence of Velux windows in a scattered proportion of the properties.
4. This part of the row is located near the junction between Collyer Avenue and Plough Lane. While Plough Lane has a predominantly commercial visual appearance, Collyer Avenue is largely residential in character. Due to the orientation of the buildings and the lack of any effective screening, the dormer would be highly visible from the public highway along Collyer Avenue, making it a prominent feature of the street scene.
5. The proposed development would be the first instance of a dormer in this row of retail and residential terracing. It would occupy almost the entirety of the roofspace above the appeal site. The introduction of a large rearward projection from the roof would detract from the strong pitched roof profile which is characteristic of this row. As such, it would disrupt the marked balance and rhythm described above, both in terms of the host building and the surrounding pattern of development.

6. The plans indicate that the dormer would be rendered rather than using matching roof tiles. While the use of matching materials could be secured by condition, the fundamental issue of the dormer's design and its impact on the surrounding area would remain.
7. In conclusion, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would not respond sympathetically to the local context or character, contrary to Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It would have a detrimental effect on the area's overall character, contrary to the Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2006) (SPD).

Other Matters

8. While the appeal site is located above a commercial host building, the purpose of the proposed development is to provide additional space for residential accommodation. Thus, it is appropriate for the SPD to be considered.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Lo

INSPECTOR