



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2022

by J Evans BA(Hons) AssocRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3292948

291 Peterborough Road, Carshalton SM5 1DF

- 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 & Mrs G Hand against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/02305, dated 16 November 2011, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a proposed single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal seeks to provide a single storey lean-to extension to the front, roadside elevation of the appeal property. The extension would run the width of the appeal site and would utilise matching materials to the host dwelling.
4. The appeal property is situated amongst a linear run of terraced two storey dwellings. The properties along the street are set back from Peterborough Road via intervening front gardens, which have overtime, in the majority of cases, been opened up to provide for private parking spaces.
5. Some of the properties along the street have also extended to the front, with no particular prevalent design characteristic, however in the majority of cases, the extensions have not covered the entirety of the width of their associated plot. Thereby, the front extensions are predominately subservient additions, where the principal elevation of the property remains legible, and can still be understood and appreciated.
6. I acknowledge that no.295, a couple of properties along to the south-west of the appeal site has an extension running the full width of its front elevation. But to my mind I do not consider this represents a positive precedent to follow, this extension is overly dominant in my view and detracts from the character and appearance of the property.

7. I also acknowledge that the appellants could potentially extend to the front elevation under permitted development rights. However, this would not result in an addition running the entire width of the appeal property.
8. Ultimately, none of the above materially alters my conclusions. An extension running the full width of the appeal property would to my mind lack subservience and would represent an overly dominant addition to the front elevation. It would override the prevailing characteristics of the appeal property and that of the wider street scene.
9. For the above reasons, I find conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016 to 2031, adopted in February 2018; SPD 4 'Design of Residential Extensions' and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Evans

INSPECTOR