



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020

by David Cliff BA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3248206
76 Tweedale Road, Carshalton SM5 1SQ

- 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 DM2019/02022, dated 27 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described in the planning application form as 'demolished existing rear storage and erection of a two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension, and new entrance porch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. There is currently a substantial gap between the flank wall of the existing dwelling and the adjacent boundary with Winchcombe Road. The dwelling on the opposite side of Winchcombe Road, notwithstanding a small single storey side projection, also has a substantial gap between its main flank wall and the side boundary.
4. A substantial gap between flank elevation and side boundary on corner plots is a common feature of the residential area in the locality of the site. The resulting prevailing pattern of development, with gaps at corner plots, provides a degree of spaciousness and visual relief within the tightly arranged terraces that generally characterise this part of the St Helier Estate. As such, these spaces on corner plots make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal site is located at the periphery of the residential area and located adjacent to a sports centre. I also observed at my site visit that there are several other corner plots within the vicinity that offer a greater degree of spaciousness and separation than the appeal site. Nevertheless, the appeal site is still a reasonably prominent site and these factors do not undermine my finding on the positive contribution made by the existing gap to the boundary at the appeal site.

6. The proposed two-storey side extension would considerably increase the width, massing and prominence of the existing dwelling and would significantly reduce the gap to the side boundary with Winchcombe Road. Whilst a smaller gap would be retained, this would be generally out of keeping with the large majority of corner plots in residential streets within the surrounding area.
7. Although some other corner sites within the area are free of significant boundary enclosures, the presence of the existing boundary hedge at the appeal site does not to any significant extent reduce the visual openness in this location. The presence of the proposed two storey side extension would have a significantly greater visual effect. Furthermore, whilst the considerable separation distance would be maintained to the flank wall of 400 Winchcombe Road, this would not negate the impact of the proposed extension at the street corner.
8. I have been referred in the appellant's statement to other permissions granted in the locality. Where details have been provided (39 Stavordale Road, 58 Tintern Road and 55 Titchfield Road) the respective developments all appear to leave considerable spacing to the side boundaries of their plots. They therefore differ to the appeal proposal where the proposed extension would substantially infill the space between the flank wall and the adjacent boundary. At my site visit I also observed other extensions that have been carried out to existing properties on corner plots. However, my prevailing observation of these is that they do not harmfully infill space to the same extent as the appeal proposal. Consequently, I do not consider that these examples provide significant justification in this case.
9. The proposed development two storey side extension would therefore be significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the design aims of Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 along with the design aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016. It would also conflict with the general aims of Supplementary Planning Documents 4 'The design of Residential Extensions' and 14 'Creating Locally Distinctive Places' to preserve positive features of Sutton's suburban character.
10. The Council also refers to the side extension not being set back from the main elevation at first floor level. Given that the appeal building is at the end of a terrace of properties and so essentially would continue its general form, I do not find harm of any great significance in this regard alone. However, this does not alleviate the harm that would result from the overall width of the side extension and its effect on the existing space at this corner site.
11. Whilst the appeal scheme has been designed to enhance the habitable functional space for the applicants, this would not outweigh the harm that I have found would result.
12. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR