



---

## 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: 29<sup>th</sup> April 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/21/3281754**  
**9 Whitland Road, Carshalton SM5 1QX**

- 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 Svetoslav Tenev against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
  - The application Ref DM2021/00603, dated 24 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two-storey front/side/rear extension, refuse store and cycle parking.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part one, part two-storey front/side/rear extension, refuse store and cycle parking, at 9 Whitland Road, Carshalton SM5 1QX in accordance with the terms of the application, DM2021/00603, dated 24 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: GGD-318-P01, GGD-318-P02, GGD-318-P03, GGD-318-P04, GGD-318-P05, GGD-318-P06 and GGD-318-P07 Rev A.

### Preliminary Matters

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 and concisely describes the development and therefore, I have used it for my decision.
3. When I arrived for my site visit nobody was present to allow access, however, I could sufficiently see the property from the public highway to undertake my assessment.

### Main Issue

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

## Reasons

5. The end of terrace property is part of the St Helier Estate formed of terraced properties of a similar form with gaps at the road junctions. No.9 is adjacent to the crossroad of Whitland Road and Welbeck Road, it has a number of single storey structures which extend up to the side boundary and an enclosed driveway to the front.
6. This proposal follows a previous scheme for a two-storey side extension which was dismissed on appeal in December 2020 (APP/P5870/D/20/3248394). The proposal has been revised and now comprises a smaller two-storey extension with a single storey wrap around element.
7. In line with the previous decision, I agree that the breaks in the built form around the road junctions provide openness and an appreciation of the estate layout. At ground level views are obscured, and in particular the space between No.9 and 77 Welbeck Road (No.77) has a cluttered appearance with parking, fencing, a substation and exposed blockwork extension.
8. The total width of the development would be similar to the previous scheme; however, the two-storey extension has been reduced by 2.5m, set down from the ridgeline and inset from the front elevation. While the extension would still be more than half the width of the host property, in my view, sufficient space would be retained at first floor level to maintain the visual gap between No.9 and No.77. The single storey elements would in part extend up to the tapered boundary towards the rear, but a gap would be created at the front between the extension and side boundary. The rear element has a limited height, designed with a flat roof and the Council indicate that they have no objection to the rear extension.
9. While the overall scale of the extension is large, the property benefits from a wide plot and the proposal replaces a number of existing ad hoc structures. The materials and roof profile would match the host property, yet there would be a subservience with the different roof levels breaking up the elongated front elevation. In my view, the design takes a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach, and the appearance of the side elevation would be enhanced.
10. My attention has been drawn to other developments in the locality which exhibit variation in the width and form compared to the host property. Whilst each proposal is to be considered on its own merits, I agree with the appellant that it demonstrates that the Council have applied the design guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 Design of Residential Extensions (SPD4) flexibly, where the context permits. In this case, while the width of the extension exceeds the guidance, I find that the overall design would be sympathetic to the host property and not overly dominant in the street scene, which are the general aims of the guidance.
11. Therefore, in conclusion I find that the revised proposal has addressed the previous concerns and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would accord with Sutton Local Plan 2018 policy 28, and SPD4 guidance, as a whole, which seek that development is of high-quality design and respects the local context.

### **Other Matters**

12. The reason for refusal refers to policies of the London Plan 2016, however this has been replaced by The London Plan March 2021 and I have not been directed to any specific policies from that Plan.

### **Conditions and Conclusion**

13. I have imposed the standard condition allowing 3 years to commence development and a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. A condition is also required regarding external materials to protect the character and appearance of the area. The Council had also suggested a condition requiring a fire safety strategy, however there is no information regarding the requirements or that it relates to domestic extensions.
14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR