



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2024

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/24/3343951

2, Netley Close, Cheam, SM3 8DN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs J. Delaney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2023/01349.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with alterations to roof line, dormer window at rear, flank window and rooflights in front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development proposed as it is more comprehensive than that on the application forms and covers the work set out on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its setting in the street scene.

Reasons

Background

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property which lies at one end of a residential street of similar properties. The house is two storey with a timber framed extended partial gable at the front. It appears that the building is converted horizontally into two flats with an open external staircase to the first-floor accommodation at the rear.
5. It is proposed to extend the hipped roof form and make a gable end and construct a dormer window at the rear and 4 roof lights on the front roof slope.

Effect on character and appearance

6. Visually the existing house has to be read in conjunction with its neighbour as a semi-detached pair and the properties make an attractive contribution to the local street-scene. The proposal to change the form of the roof from a hipped end to a gable would imbalance the form and design of the semis and this

would be particularly prominent on this corner site. Moreover, the rear elevation of the property is also open to view along Popinjays Row (as referred to on the submitted location map) and the rear box dormer would clearly be seen from the public realm. The dormer would extend to almost the width of the property and almost to the roof ridge line, and would appear as a stark and imposing addition to the property. Taken together, the proposed gable roof end and scale and form of box dormer, detract significantly from the architecture and form of the original dwelling and the symmetry of the pair of semis and the setting of these properties in the street scene. The proposal therefore conflicts with the provisions of Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan particularly parts (b) and (c) concerning respect for the local context of a site and the local townscape.

7. I note the appellant's view that the proposed work to increase the volume of the roof space would be 'permitted development' if the property was not converted into flats. However, this appeal has to be considered on its individual planning merits as development that requires planning permission.
8. At the visit I also took note of the other examples of rear dormers as referred to by the appellant in Netley Close and Wickham Avenue as well as other examples raised elsewhere in Sutton. Some of these could well be 'permitted development', but some have been expressly permitted by the Council. Even so, from the evidence submitted, the sites involved do not appear to have the same exposure to the public realm and the extensions proposed do not have a similar local impact on the street scene and would not be so dominant as the appeal proposal. I therefore give these examples little weight in support of the appeal scheme.

Planning balance

9. On the main issues I have found that the proposed alterations to the roof of this semi-detached property would detract significantly from its character and appearance; would spoil its symmetry as a semi-detached property and would appear intrusive in the local street scene. As such it would be in conflict with the relevant development plan policy.
10. This has to be balanced with other considerations but none outweigh the conflict therefore the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR