



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3287153 88 Tintern Road, Carshalton SM5 1QG

- 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 Miss Hemlata Patel against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/01647, dated 5 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft space involving alterations to existing roofline, a dormer extension at rear, erection of a part one, part two storey side extension and formation of a front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development on the decision notice is different to that on the application form and whilst there is no formal agreement to the change in my view it more accurately describes the development and therefore, I have used that for my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and the host property.

Reasons

4. No.88 is an end of terrace property located in a row of terraced properties of the same general form with hipped roofs and the entrance to the end properties is to the side. The proposal would create a two-storey side extension in filling the gap up to the shared boundary with the neighbour, No.90, and a new entrance porch to the front. At roof level the profile would be changed to a gable end with a box dormer to the rear.
5. Supplementary Planning Document: Design of Residential Extensions (SPD4) provides advice to applicants seeking to extend their property. The aim is for extensions to be sympathetic with the appearance of the original property and to respect the character of the area. Whilst guidance, it specifically seeks to resist visual terracing and explains that altering hipped roofs to gables is unlikely to be supported due to the dominant impact.

6. The proposed extension is limited in width but would significantly reduce the spacing between No.88 and No.90, and the alterations to the roof form would disrupt the rhythm of the prevailing roofscape. Additionally, the rear dormer extension would encapsulate the majority of the existing roof and accentuate the property's overall mass, resulting in a top-heavy appearance.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the extensions to No.125, opposite, which appear to be very similar to the appeal proposal. Whilst I understand the appellant's concerns regarding consistency in decision making the development is an anomaly in the street scene. I accept that over time features have been changed, nevertheless, the general form and appearance of the properties in the street and wider estate have been maintained, particularly at the upper level where there is regularity in the roof form. The other examples highlighted by the appellant where significant alterations have occurred are noticeable and, in my view, do not enhance the character of the area. Thereby their existence does not persuade me that the appeal proposal would be appropriate, and each case is to be considered on its own merits. Moreover, I do not find the proposal before me acceptable when assessed against the development plan and the guidance in SPD4.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed fenestration and materials would match with the existing property and that there is the potential for some alterations to be made under permitted development. Nonetheless, it is the combination and scale of the proposal which would be out of keeping, and these aspects would not overcome the harm I have identified.
9. Therefore, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and host property. Accordingly, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) and SPD4 which together seek that development is designed to the highest standards and respects local context.

Other Matters

10. I understand the appellant's desire to extend their property and that modern day living has changed from when these properties were built. However, I have no evidence that the existing dwelling is inadequate or that the property could not be improved by a development more in keeping with the area. I therefore give these matters little weight in my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR