
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3292677
76 Tweeddale Road, Carshalton SM5 1SQ

- 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 and Mrs Tenev against the decision of London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/02339, dated 23 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2022.
 - The proposed development is demolishing the existing rear storage and erection of single-storey side/rear extension. The project also includes a new front entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. My attention has been drawn to a previous appeal concerning the site (reference APP/P5870/D/20/3248206). I shall have regard to this background when considering the merits of this proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, end-terrace house on the junction between Tweeddale Road and Winchcombe Road within the St Helier housing estate. The plot lies opposite an area of open space.
5. Although it has been reduced to single storey, the width of the proposal when viewed from Tweeddale Road, at some 4.5 metres, is the same as the previous appeal scheme. The length of development facing Winchcombe Road has been increased to approximately 12 metres, and as a result the footprint of the proposed would substantially exceed that of the existing dwelling.
6. The upper walls and roof of the element would be visible from the public highway to the front and side over the existing boundary gate and fence, and from the back gardens of neighbouring dwellings. To my mind, the excessive scale of the scheme would introduce a prominent and intrusive feature that would compete with the diminutive size of the host property.

7. The imposing appearance of the extension results in a dominant and boxy roof form, and this would be in stark contrast to the hipped roof of the main house. The gap to the side boundary with Winchcombe Road would be significantly reduced, which would be out of keeping with the large majority of corner plots in the area, where a sense of spaciousness has been retained.
8. I appreciate that there would be no adverse impacts on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, and the proposal would be constructed in materials to match the existing house. However, these matters do not outweigh the detriment that I have identified above. I have also been referred to the presence of other extensions that have been granted permission in the Borough. Nevertheless, additions to other houses would be neutral considerations in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
9. I conclude that the scheme would be injurious to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would contravene Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 and the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4: The Design of Residential Extensions and Supplementary Planning Document 14 'Creating Locally Distinctive Places'. Cumulatively these seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR