



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3262499

70 Kenny Drive, Carshalton, SM5 4PH

- 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 Ashil Amin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/00344, dated 6 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2020.
 - The development is a front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The application was submitted retrospectively and the porch was in place at the time of my site visit. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey building with a front porch located on Kenny Road, a cul-de-sac within a modern residential estate built around the late 1990's. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of housing types including detached and semi-detached houses, terraced dwellings, and apartment buildings. In the direct vicinity of the appeal site and within the wider housing estate, I noted that most properties feature front entrance porches that are broadly similar in design and scale being mostly modestly sized and open with timber detailing.
 6. The front entrance porch in question incorporates a gabled roof, projects out by around 1.78 m and has a width of 1.82 m. Given its considerable bulk, white rendered walls and glazed door, the porch appears incongruous and dominant in the context of the other open small porches, and adversely alters the
-

character and appearance of the host building. Although the appellant states that the gabled roof design with hung tiles matches the front dormers of the building and that the white render matches the white window frames, I find that the scale of the roof is excessive and the render negatively contrasts with the brick façade of the property. The glazed door also appears odd in this context and constitutes an inharmonious addition to the building and streetscene.

7. Furthermore, whilst the appellant opines that the porch is modest and only exceeds the GPDO floorspace limit for a porch by 0.25 sq. metres, it is nonetheless visibly larger than the porches in the vicinity. Its disproportionate depth and undue bulk, coupled with the use of unsympathetic materials, means the porch appears prominently in the streetscene and harms the appearance of the area.
8. I have had regard to the examples of porches allowed within the borough of Sutton referred to by the appellant, however none of these developments are located near the appeal site nor do they appear to be similar in design and scale to the porch at No.70. I do not find them comparable or relevant to the case before me.
9. The development therefore fails to tie-in with the underlying design approach to porches within the estate and it is detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
10. Given the above, I conclude that the porch conflicts with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan which aims to ensure that proposals for alterations and extensions are designed to the highest standard, respond to local character and are of suitable scale, massing and height. I have also had regard to the guidance contained in the 'Design for Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document 4 which states that new porches should reflect the character of the host dwelling and street with matching materials and appropriate proportions.

Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR