



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by Martin Small BA(Hons) BPI DipCM MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3248394

9 Whitland Road, Carshalton, SM5 1QX

- 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 Tenev against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/02129, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolishing existing rear POD bathroom and side storage, erection of a two-storey side extension and new front entrance porch.
-

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 host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. Whitland Road forms part of the St Helier Estate, a 'garden suburb' dating from the 1930s. The Estate is characterised by short blocks of terraced houses of a similar scale and design, creating a regular pattern of development. The gaps between the blocks on the corners at the junctions of the Estate roads are a particular feature. These gaps provide relief from the built development and contribute to a sense of spaciousness that reflects the original design ethos of the Estate.
4. The appeal property is located on the corner of Whitland Road and Welbeck Road, which form a crossroads. Views between the blocks of houses on the corners of this crossroads at ground level are obstructed by fencing, vegetation and single-storey buildings such that these corners are not as open as some of the others on the Estate. Nevertheless, sufficient gaps remain above these obstructions to provide openness and an appreciation of the Estate layout.
5. The proposed extension would replace a small single-storey rear extension and a larger single-storey side extension. The latter extends to the boundary of the appeal property with its neighbour, 77 Welbeck Road (No 77), and presents a utilitarian concrete block elevation to Welbeck Road. The proposed extension would not project as far, with a small gap between it and the property boundary and would be staggered to reflect the angle of the boundary. It would be of a more coherent appearance overall than the existing extensions.

6. However, that part of the proposed extension adjacent to the host dwelling would be in line with the front elevation of and have the same ridge height as the dwelling. The extension as a whole would be more than double the width of the host dwelling. In these respects, the extension would dominate the host dwelling and not conform with the guidance for 2-storey extensions set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 *Design of Residential Extensions*. The elongated form of the extended dwelling would be at odds with its current proportions and those of the majority of other dwellings on the Estate.
7. Moreover, it would be 2-storey and, notwithstanding its being staggered to reflect the angled boundary of the property, would be of substantial mass. Although that part of the extension closest to that boundary would be of a lower ridge height than the remainder of the extension and the host dwelling, its height in relation to its proximity to that boundary would result in a cramped appearance.
8. The proposed extension would not be visible in longer views towards the appeal property along Whitland Road or Welbeck Road due to it not extending beyond the front elevations of either the host dwelling or No 77. However, it would be very clearly visible when closer to and would be prominent from the corners of the crossroads formed by those two roads. With its 2-storey form, the extension would fill a substantial proportion of the gap between the host dwelling and No 77 and partially obstruct the view through it.
9. Consequently, the extension would significantly erode the spaciousness that is a characteristic of this crossroads and the Estate as a whole. In this respect the proposal would not conform with Design Principle 1 "Building on local character" of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 14 *Creating Locally Distinctive Places*. This seeks to ensure that development respects the positive features of Sutton's suburban character.
10. The appellants have drawn my attention to a number of other properties in the area that have had 2-storey extensions approved, thus demonstrating that such extensions are acceptable in principle. I do not have the full details of the extensions to 32 Tavistock Road, 56 Tavistock Road or 200 Wrythe Lane to establish their comparability to the proposal before me. From the details I do have the extensions to 55 Titchfield Road and 39 Stavordale Road are narrower than the proposal and significant space remains at 58 Tintern Road.
11. I observed during my site visit that significant gaps still remain between 20 Whitland Road and 1 Welbeck Road and their respective neighbours. In these respects, these approved developments differ from the proposal before me and I therefore give them little weight in my decision. Moreover, I have determined this proposal on its own merits.
12. I therefore conclude that despite its more coherent appearance, overall, the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the St Helier Estate. Accordingly, in this respect, the proposal would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan¹ which, amongst other things, require development to have regard to local character and be of high quality design appropriate to its context.

¹ The Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated With Alterations Since 2011

13. The proposal would also conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (2018) which sets out that planning permission will be granted for new development provided that it, amongst other things, respects the local context, responds to local character and is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site. Furthermore, as the proposal would not represent appropriate change, it would be contrary to paragraph 127 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires planning decisions to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history.

Other Matters

14. I understand the appellants' desire to improve the quality of the host dwelling, including its thermal properties. However, I have no evidence that the existing dwelling is substandard or inadequate or that its thermal properties could not be improved by a development more in keeping with the area. I therefore give these matters little weight in my decision.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR