



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2020

by L Gilbert BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/19/3240039

58 Warnham Court Road, Carshalton SM5 3LZ

- 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 De Magalhaes Lorente against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/01059, dated 19 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension and front porch at No 58 Warnham Court Road, Carshalton SM5 3LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2019/01059, dated 19 June 2019, 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: OS Map 1:1250, CO/M.L/01, CO/L/02 Rev.A1.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property contains a semi-detached house, paired with No 56 Warnham Court Road. Both neighbouring properties of No 56 and No 60 Warnham Court Road have two-storey side extensions. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, characterised by semi-detached properties with single storey side garages or two storey side extensions.
4. The appeal property currently has a single storey garage at the side of the property, which lies flush with the front wall of the house and has a lean to behind. The proposed replacement two storey extension would be set back 1

metre from the front wall of the house at first floor level, would have a hipped roof and be set down from the roof ridge. The proposed extension would be around half the width of the main house. In this regard, the Council does not dispute that these features are consistent with the guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document 4: Design of Residential Extensions (2006) (SPD4), and it would mean that the pair of properties would not appear overly wide.

5. SPD4 resists visual terracing where gaps between dwellings are a characteristic of the streetscene, and the Supplementary Planning Document 14: Creating Locally Distinctive Places (2008) (SPD14) seeks amongst other things, that development respects the positive features of Sutton's suburban character, creating local distinctiveness and a sense of identity. Notable first floor gaps are prevalent between the pairs of semi-detached properties along the street.
6. Although the existing first floor gap between the appeal property and No 60 Warnham Court Road would be significantly diminished by the proposed extension, the adjoining side extension at No 60 Warnham Court Road incorporates similar design features to the proposal and this would help to avoid the proposal from creating a harmful terracing effect with its neighbours. I consider the effect of visual terracing would be lessened by the proposed set back at first floor level and from the roof ridge, along with the proposed hipped roof. Together, these features would lessen the prominence of the proposed extension along the road and would help to avoid the appearance of terracing.
7. Accordingly, with regard to SPD4 and SPD14, I find the proposed two-storey side extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would comply with the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (2018) Policy 28 which seeks amongst other things, that new development respects the local context and responds to local character and is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site and/or townscape.

Conditions

8. A matching materials condition is included to ensure the proposed extension complements the appearance of the main house and the surrounding area. The approved plans are detailed in a condition as a matter of clarity. I have not included a condition as requested by the Council, with respect to the extension not being used as an independent unit of residential accommodation. This is because there is no evidence as to how this could occur under the scope of this permission for an extension to a single dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

L Gilbert

INSPECTOR