



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/22/3300182

258 Carshalton Road, Sutton SM1 4SB

- 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 Chi Park, The Architecture Factory against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2022/00091, dated 17 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of walkway frame and cover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application form indicates that the development applied for has already been completed. I have determined the appeal on that basis, and with regard to the submitted plans which ostensibly align with the walkway frame and cover that I saw in place at my visit.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a semi-detached dwelling close to the junction of Carshalton Road with Kings Lane. Many of the nearby dwellings on this side of the street have extensions to their rear, and most have outbuildings. However, the outbuildings that I was able to observe were generally of modest scale and were positioned towards the rear of the plots beyond intervening open gardens of relatively large depth. The proportions of the spaces between the dwellings and outbuildings provide for a clear impression of separation between them, and a degree of openness to the rear of this part of Carshalton Road.
5. The appeal relates to a walkway frame and cover between an outbuilding and a single-storey extension to the rear of the host dwelling. The development is open-sided, and is of modest width adjacent to the boundary with 256 Carshalton Road.
6. However, it is of substantial height, projecting well above the fence along the boundary with No 256 and higher too than the single-storey projection to the rear of this neighbour. It would also run the full depth of the retained garden between the dwelling and outbuilding, contrary to guidance in the Design of

Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2006 that extensions should not take up the entire length of the garden. I acknowledge that a significant proportion of the width and overall area of the garden remains open and usable, and that the open sides afford views through the frame.

Nevertheless, the solid roof of dark corrugated metal is fairly conspicuous standing so far above the boundary treatment, and I find despite its lightweight appearance that the development is clearly appreciated as a sizeable built structure on the site. In my judgement, the combined height and depth of the development cause it to appear visually dominant and disproportionate against the site, and it disrupts the prevailing pattern of relationships and open spaces between dwellings and outbuildings.

7. Although the appellant asserts that the development is discreetly sited to the rear of the property, I saw that it was clearly visible including in views across the site from Kings Lane and the junction of Carshalton Road with Kings Lane where it can be seen in conjunction with the outbuilding and dwelling. In these views, the presence of development along the full depth of the garden is striking against the generally open central sections of gardens nearby which lack built form of any significant scale. Notwithstanding its open sides and irrespective of the materials and design which I accept are in keeping with the existing development on the site, I find as a consequence that the development is an incongruous and unsympathetic feature which detracts from its surroundings.
8. I have no firm reason to find that the size of the remaining garden is inadequate to meet the needs of the occupiers of the site for amenity space, nor that there is detriment to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Be that as it may, I conclude for the above reasons that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018. Amongst other things, this policy seeks development of suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site and/or townscape and that respects the local context and responds to the local character of an area. For the same reasons, I find that it does not comprise high quality design that is sympathetic to local character as sought by the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. The appellant advises that the development provides protection from the rain for journeys between the dwelling and outbuilding which is used as a home office, and I note the indicated number of rainy days annually as well as the frequency of journeys made. However, I find that the benefits to the appellant are insufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the area, and the resulting conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR