



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3229899
215 Welbeck Road, Carshalton SM5 1LN

- 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 Jaroslaw Sekowski against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/00370, dated 28 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached storage building and erection of a close boarded fence along the boundary line and back edge of the pavement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The fence and outbuilding have been erected and therefore I am considering the appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Welbeck Road is mostly characterised by two-storey terraced and semi-detached houses. Plots are generally set back from the road frontage with front gardens which are enclosed by low walls, hedges and fencing. As with many Local Authority planned housing estates, the areas of open space, mature trees, low walls and hedges bordering front gardens add to the sense of spaciousness. Dwellings on corner plots are integral to that sense of openness due to the large side gardens which abut the street.
5. 215 Welbeck Road is an end of terraced property located at the entrance to a cul-de-sac. It has a side garden area in a prominent corner location adjacent to the boundary with 213 Welbeck Road.
6. The fence encompasses the side garden of the appeal property extending along the boundary with the footpath. The drawings confirm that the fencing is between 2 metres and 2.2 metres high. It is wood constructed with concrete posts and plinth. The outbuilding is a wooden structure designed with overhanging eaves. The elevation is angled where the building meets the joint boundary with no 213. The rear elevation of the outbuilding is on the site's

front boundary, with the eaves level of the mono-pitched roof and the guttering visible above the fence.

7. The fence and the outbuilding are prominent features on the approach to the site along Welbeck Road and within the cul-de-sac. I find that given the height, length and prominence of the fence and outbuilding and the outbuilding's siting and design the development forms a large, obtrusive and incongruous feature in the street scene which is at odds with the prevailing spacious character.
8. I appreciate that there are existing buildings and fencing within the plot on the opposite corner. However, there is nothing to indicate that planning permission was granted for that adjacent development. Moreover, the fence and buildings are set further into the cul-de-sac and are less visible on the approach to the site. Consequently, the existence of the development on the adjacent property does not justify further harm.
9. I conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016 – 2031 adopted February 2018 which requires that new buildings, alterations and extensions make a positive contribution to the street frontage, street scene and/or public realm. The development also conflicts with the Supplementary Planning Document Creating Locally Distinctive Places Sutton's Urban Design Guide which, requires that development respects the positive features of Sutton's suburban character.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellant says he was not aware of the need for planning permission and was not advised otherwise. Be that as it may, it is clear that permission is required for the structures and I am required to consider them in light of the relevant policies of the development plan.

Conclusion

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

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR