



---

## 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/21/3285942**

**377A Middleton Road, Carshalton SM5 1HT**

- 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 Krzysztof Niemiec against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
  - The application Ref DM2021/01510, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2021.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor side extension and extension of the existing ground floor flank roof.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice rather than the application form as it more accurately describes the development and therefore, I have used it for my decision.

### Main Issue

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

### Reason

4. The appeal property is part of a short terrace of properties which have a cranked form and extend around the corner of Middleton Road and Peterborough Road. This form is replicated on the other corners and the layout and openness around the road junction contributes to a sense of spaciousness and an appreciation of the original estate.
5. No.377A is an addition to the terrace and has a relatively limited triangular shaped plot. A single storey extension infills the area up to the side boundary and the proposed first floor extension would sit above, albeit slightly inset from the side elevation. The width of the extension would exceed the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4: The Design of Residential Extensions (SPD4), and while the roof would be set down the pitch would not fully align with the host property.
6. To the side, No.375, which is split into two flats, has an entrance door and first floor windows in its side elevation. The first-floor extension would significantly reduce the gap between these properties with the only meaningful space

retained on the neighbour's side. The gap would be less than those typically found between terraced blocks along Middleton Road, and notably the corner blocks have a greater separation. The introduction of No.377A has already altered the scale of this corner block, nevertheless, a sense of space to the side has been retained and the existing single storey element reflects the form at the other end of the block at No.180A. In my view, the loss of the gap would diminish the distinctive form and openness of the corner block and the prevailing pattern of development.

7. Overall, I find that the scale and form of the extension would be out of keeping with the host property and would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would thereby conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) and SPD4 which, amongst other things, seek development that is of high-quality design, respects the local context and is in sympathy to the original property.

### **Other matters**

8. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to extend their property and that the materials could match the existing property, which at the time of my site visit was being rendered. Nevertheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have found and the conflict with the development plan.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR