



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/22/3296240

102A High Street, Carshalton SM5 3AE

- 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 Mark Kenyon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2021/01376, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'second floor loft extension+, two storey rear extension and part single storey extension to create two self contained flats'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council does not raise any concerns in respect to the single and 2 storey extension. This appeal therefore relates only to the proposed roof extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed roof extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Carshalton Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a 2 storey Victorian mid-terrace property. It has a commercial use on the ground floor with a flat above. There are 2 units at the end of the terrace which are 3 storeys in height. Similar to other properties within this terrace, the appeal property has an outrigger, which has a lower ridge than the principal part of the building.
5. The significance of this part of the CA derives from the historic high street, which contains a mix of medieval to modern buildings. The Victorian terraced properties, with shops below form part of the evolution of this high street. The uniformity of the outriggers and largely unaltered roofs on these terraces make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA
6. The proposed roof extension would extend from the apex of the main roof, across its full width and over part of the outrigger. It would have an almost vertical profile. The additional high-level bulk of the proposal would result in the appeal property having an awkward top-heavy appearance. The proposed

- roof extension would have a box like form that would have a discordant appearance on the roof.
7. Although the proposed roof extension would not be visible from the High Street, the large flat roof would protrude above the height of the existing outrigger and would appear as an incongruous feature on the roof of this terrace. The proposed roof extension would be visible in views from Rotherfield Road, Carshalton Place, the access road to the rear and from neighbouring properties, including land within the CA. In these views, the roof extension would appear as an unsympathetic addition to the host property and would unbalance the relative symmetry of the terrace.
 8. My attention has been drawn to other extensions on this terrace, particularly the roof extension at No 98 High Street. The form, scale and detailing of the roof extension at No 98 is different to that proposed here and does not justify the harm that I have identified.
 9. Having regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), the proposed roof extension by reason of its size, design and siting would appear unduly prominent and fail to respect the architectural character of the host building and terrace. Consequently, the proposal would not preserve the character or appearance of the CA. However, in the context of the CA as a whole, the proposal would be relatively modest. The proposed roof extension would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. It is therefore necessary for this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the development.
 10. The proposal would provide a new dwelling, which would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) objective of boosting the supply of housing. Even so, the provision of one additional dwelling would only provide a small benefit, which would not outweigh the great weight that I am required to give to the CA as a heritage asset. I therefore conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with the Framework.
 11. Overall, I conclude that the proposed roof extension would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA and would be contrary to Policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031, adopted in 2018, which seek to ensure that development respects its local context and conserves and where practicable, enhances the significance of a heritage asset. The proposal would also conflict with the Carshalton Village CA Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2019 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 14: Creating Locally Distinctive Places, which require that proposals deliver high quality design and that extensions are subservient and respect the character of the existing building and the area.
 12. The proposal is clearly intended to provide an additional residential unit to a building in commercial use with a residential flat above, rather than an extension to an existing dwelling. As such, while I have considered the principles in the Council's Design of Residential Extensions SPD, it would not be appropriate to overly rely on them in judging the design quality of the proposal. The contents of the SPD have not therefore materially influenced my reasoning on this matter.

Other Matters

13. The proposed single-storey and 2 storey extensions would be in keeping with other extensions on the terrace. Given their size, height, design and siting, they would be largely screened from the public realm by the existing built form. Having regard to the Act, I find that the single storey and 2 storey extensions would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the Framework and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR