



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: 06 September 2021

Appeal Refs: APP/P5870/D/21/3275885

94 Carshalton Park Road, Carshalton, SM5 3SW

- The appeals are made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusals to grant planning permission.
 - The appeals are made by Mr Alex Snigorski against the decisions of London Borough of Sutton.
 - Appeal Ref APP/P5870/D/21/3271107 -The application Ref DM2021/00065, dated 14 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - Appeal ref. APP/P5870/D/21/3275885- The application Ref DM2021/00532, dated 16 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'erection of a part one part two storey side/ front extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. They differ only the detail of the design of the proposed extensions. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
3. The description of development for appeal 3271107 was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description.
4. 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

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; including whether the proposals make adequate provision for tree protection and whether the proposals conserve or enhance the significance of Park Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. 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.

7. 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.
8. The appeal schemes would introduce a further extension to this flank wall. The proposal for 3271107 would do this with a dual-hipped roof-form and a tapered flank wall. The proposal for 3275885 would have a half-hipped roof and a straight flank wall. Both extensions 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 roof-form design of appeal 3271107 would appear complex and poorly integrated with the host dwelling and semi-detached pair.
9. Whilst there are a variety of building styles and scales within Carshalton Road, the appeal schemes 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 prominent siting of the extensions. 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 proposals would have a detrimental effect on the setting of the CA.
10. 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. No evidence supported the application for appeal 3271107 to show that harm to the trees would be prevented or mitigated. Whilst some preliminary tree survey information was submitted for appeal 3275885, the information is not sufficient to demonstrate that the scheme would not encroach onto, or cause damage to, the root systems of those trees.
11. For these reasons, the appeal proposals 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 schemes 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 proposals are 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

12. The appeals are dismissed for the reasons stated above.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR