



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23rd May 2024

by Megan Thomas KC Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 17th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/24/3339183

281 Welbeck Road, Carshalton SM5 1LN

- 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 Servet Krruci against the decision of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref.DM2023/01785, dated 27 November 2023 , was refused by notice dated 23 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front extension and alterations to the ground floor flank fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey front extension and alterations to the ground floor flank fenestration at 281 Welbeck Road, Carshalton SM5 1LN in accordance with the planning application Ref.DM2023/01785, dated 27 November 2023 subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: plan numbers S.02, EX.01, EX.02, P.01, P.02 & S.01

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, terraced properties and the streetscene.

Reasons

2. The appeal site is a two storey end-of-terrace dwelling at the rear of a small inset of Welbeck Road where there is a parking area and a communal grassed area. Around the inset there are three short terraces of dwellings at right angles to each other. The appeal site is in the north west corner. Its main door is on its flank elevation. It has a front, side and rear garden.

3. On the same terrace of properties but at the opposite end is no.275 Welbeck Road which has been added to with a two storey side extension and single storey front extension and a front porch. A number of other nearby dwellings have been extended with single storey front or side extensions. I also noted several front porches and full width front extensions on other properties on Welbeck Road.
4. The proposed development would include a front extension which would be the full width of no.281 and would have a mono pitched roof. The main door to the property would be in the front extension and the existing flank door would be removed.
5. 'Design of Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document 4 states that front elevations of dwellings are the most difficult to alter or extend satisfactorily because this is often the most visible elevation. They can upset the architectural integrity of a dwelling and/or a row of terraced dwellings.
6. I consider the proposed extension to be very modest in nature. It would be about a metre deep and single storey. Even extending the full width of no.281, it would not be unduly dominant or unsympathetic. The simple pitch of the proposed roof would reflect the simple hipped main roof. The insertion of a front door on the front elevation would improve legibility and would reflect the other properties on the terrace - nos 275, 277 and 279.
7. Turning to the pleasing symmetry, which is often found in rows of terraces, the significant alterations at the opposite end of the terrace at 275 include ground floor front elements. Whilst the proposal is of a different design than those front elements, it nevertheless provides some re-balancing and would be a modest subservient addition to the terrace as well as the host dwelling.
8. The front garden at the appeal property would not be unduly reduced in size and whilst the proposal would change the appearance of the host dwelling it would remain set behind a front amenity space. It would not intrude unduly into the streetscene.
9. Overall, given the characteristics of the area I have described above, the resulting development would sufficiently respect the characteristics of the terrace, the streetscene and the local context and character.
10. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling, the row of terraces or the wider area. It would not conflict with policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (adopted 2018) or with the guidance in the Design of Residential Extensions SPD4.

Conditions

11. The Council suggested some conditions in the event that the appeal was allowed. I have considered those in the light of advice in the National Planning Practice Guidance. For the avoidance of doubt there is a condition which ties the development to the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area there is a condition which requires the materials used in the external surfaces of the development to match the materials in the main dwelling.

Conclusion

12. Accordingly, having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR