



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2021

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3271107

94 Carshalton Park Road, Carshalton, SM5 3SW

- 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 Alex Snigorski against the decision of London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/00065, dated 14 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'erection of a part one part two storey side/ front extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description. A further appeal, Ref. APP/P5870/D/21/3275885 has been made by the Appellant in respect of the site. This appeal is at an early stage and will be subject to a separate decision letter.
3. The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. I am satisfied that the equivalent policies in the revised Framework have broadly the same approach as their counterparts, and they do not alter my conclusions on the matter in any case.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; including whether the proposal makes adequate provision for tree protection and whether the proposal conserves or enhances the significance of Park Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on a corner plot fronting Carshalton Road and flanking Wales Avenue. Both Carshalton Road and Wales Avenue are predominantly residential roads. The site is outside of the Park Hill Conservation Area (CA), though the site abuts the boundary of the CA and forms part of its setting.
6. The appeal site comprises an attractive semi-detached house (the host dwelling). The residential accommodation of the host dwelling has been

extended into the roof space and the original hipped roof-form has been replaced with a large side-facing gable, whereas its semi-detached partner has retained its original hipped roof-form. Due to its corner plot siting and orientation, the gable-end is prominent within both streetscenes. The appeal scheme would introduce a further extension to this flank wall, with a dual-hipped roof-form. This extension would align with the original scale of the roof and would starkly highlight the protruding extended gable-end. The appeal scheme would therefore not respect the proportions of the host dwelling and would create an unbalanced appearance across the semi-detached pair. Moreover, the detailed design, particularly the various roof-forms, would appear complex and poorly integrated with the host dwelling and semi-detached pair.

7. Whilst there are a variety of building styles and scales within Carshalton Road, the appeal scheme would extend the host building far closer to its boundaries, creating a cramped and dominant development, uncharacteristic of the pattern of built form within both the streetscenes of Carshalton Road and Wales Avenue. This would be exacerbated by the complex and convoluted design of the scheme and its prominent siting. Although the site is not within the CA, it is within its setting, and the spacious suburban pattern of development of the vicinity does make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA. The increased prominence, tighter grain and poor design of the proposed extension would have a detrimental effect on the setting of the CA.
8. Moreover, both Carshalton Road and Wales Avenue have a verdant character by virtue of boundary treatments and the mature trees which line the streets. The trees make a strong positive contribution to the character of the area in general, and to the setting of the CA in particular. There are two mature street trees proximate to the site. The appeal scheme would bring built form much closer to those trees, especially the tree which flanks the site on Wales Avenue. The appeal scheme has potential to encroach on the root systems of those trees and to increase pressure for pruning or removal of the trees. There is no evidence supported with the application to show that harm to the trees would be prevented or mitigated.
9. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would fail to respond the character of the host building and surrounding area and would cause less than substantial harm to those elements of the CA, identified above, which contribute to its significance. Whilst the scheme would increase the residential accommodation within the host dwelling, the less than substantial harm arising would not be outweighed by this limited private benefit. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policies 28 and 29 of the Sutton Local Plan, adopted 2018, policy D4 of the London Plan 2021, relevant Supplementary Planning Documents and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a good design which respects local character and preserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusions

10. The appeal is dismissed for the reasons stated above.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR