
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2019

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3228353

42 Stanley Road, Carshalton SM5 4LF

- 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 & Mrs Francois Aloysius against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/00115, dated 17 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's Decision Notice and the appellant's Appeal Form describe the proposal as "erection of a part one, part two-storey side and rear extension.". As this more accurately reflects the proposed development I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the house and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within an area that is residential in character, primarily formed of terraces of two-storey houses with a varied external appearance. The building within the site is at the end of a terrace within a row of four houses situated at the corner of Stanley Road and Stanhope Road. The site is therefore prominent and highly visible from these streets.
5. Due to the topography of the surrounding area, the terrace is elevated above the adjacent streets. Part of the boundary with the footpath on Stanhope Road therefore incorporates a low retaining wall. Above this the boundary is marked by close boarded fencing and trellis. The terrace itself is faced with brick at ground floor and painted render above, separated by a coursing of tiles.
6. The end terrace to the opposite corner of Stanhope Road, at 40 Stanley Road, incorporates a narrow strip of land, which separates it from Stanhope Road. The terraced houses opposite the site also abut the footpaths serving South Avenue. End terraced houses next to the highway is therefore a typical arrangement within the immediate vicinity of the site.

7. The space alongside the appeal building currently provides separation and relief from the building when viewed from Stanhope Road. However, the proposed two-storey side extension would fill this space and continue beyond the rear of the house into the proposed rear extension. That part of the proposals would project as far as the rear face of the existing single-storey rear extension.
8. Whilst the raised position of the house is an attribute of the site, together with the proposed extensions being along the same plane adjacent to Stanhope Road, they would appear rather dominant and imposing when viewed from the surrounding area. Moreover, the side elevation would therefore be continuous and only interrupted by a small window. Furthermore, the use of painted render as the principal external material would also contrast with the existing architecture of the house, as described above. The proposed extensions would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the existing house and the surrounding area.
9. I note that the roof of the proposed two-storey side extension would incorporate a subordinate hipped roof with a lower ridgeline and pitch that would match the existing house. The extension would also be set back from the front face of the house at first floor. However, these elements do not overcome the harm that would result from the overall design of the proposed extensions.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing house and the surrounding area. Hence, the proposals would not therefore accord with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (2018) (the LP), which is part of the Development Plan. The proposals would also not conform with the guidance within the Council's Design of Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 4, adopted October 2006 (SPD4) to which I have had due regard. The policy and guidance therein seek to ensure that new development respects and responds to the local character and context, including the original appearance of dwellings. Design should therefore be to the highest standard, including its architectural detailing, scale, massing and height.
11. I am mindful that the appeal building is not listed and the site is not situated within a conservation area, so the preservation of the character and appearance of the area would not be afforded the same statutory protection. Whilst this may be the case, these matters do not obviate the need to achieve well designed places as outlined in the LP and SPD4.

Conclusion

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

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR