



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/25/3372004

17 Ash Close, Carshalton, SM5 2AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Vuong Tran against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2025/00809.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor side extension and a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor side extension and a single-storey rear extension at 17 Ash Close, Carshalton, SM5 2AJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2025/00809, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 5-228; 6-228; 7-228; 8-228; 9-228; 10-228; 11-228.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The Council has indicated that it has no issues with the proposed single-storey rear extension. I concur with that view. The main issue is, therefore, the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area around Ash Close.

Reasons

3. No 17 is an end-terraced house situated at the southern end of Ash Close, which is a short cul-de-sac. It is a two-storey house with a hipped roof, a wide single-storey side extension, a shallow front garden/parking area, and a moderate rear garden. The proposed development would involve the construction of a full-width single-storey rear extension, some 3 metres deep, and a full-width first-floor above the existing single-storey side extension. The first-floor side extension would be set back 0.5 metres from the existing main front elevation, and would be set down a small amount from the main roof ridge.

4. Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (LP) indicates that the Council will grant planning permission for new development, including extensions, provided the new development is attractive and designed to the highest standard; respects the local context and responds to local character; and is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site and/or townscape.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions (SPD) gives guidance on two-storey side extensions. It indicates that where gaps between dwellings are a characteristic of a street, then where extensions close this gap and visual crowding occurs, proposals will be resisted. It notes that where two-storey side extensions can be accommodated, considerations include that the extension should be read as subordinate addition with a clear setback of at least 500mm; that roof forms should respect the existing dwelling and depict lower ridgelines; and that proportionately, it should be no wider than one third to one half of the width of the existing front elevation.
6. The Council contends that the width of the proposed side extension would be excessive and overly dominant, and that it would not therefore appear as a subordinate addition. Instead, it would appear disproportionate and visually intrusive, causing harm to the character of the area and the streetscene.
7. In this case, No 17 is the end property within the cul-de-sac and it has a single-storey side extension up to the site boundary. Beyond the boundary is an access lane to the rear of the properties on Arlington Drive and then the rear gardens of those properties. There is, therefore, a large gap between the appeal property and those along Arlington Drive. Ash Close is a short road and is not characterised by gaps between dwellings. The proposed first-floor side extension would not close a gap and would not result in visual crowding. Moreover, the extension would be set back by 0.5 m and the roof form would respect the existing dwelling and be set down a small amount from the existing roof ridge.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be more than half the width of the existing front elevation. However, by virtue of the property being an end-terraced house with significant space between the southern boundary and the houses on Arlington Drive beyond, it would not be a prominent feature in the overall street scene but would be seen effectively as a continuation of the terrace. The appellant makes note of a wide two-storey extension at No 18 Ash Close opposite, which also projects to the side boundary of the property. It would appear that this development was granted permission before the adoption of the current LP, but it nevertheless is extant and is an established feature of the streetscene. On this basis, the current proposal at No 17 would not appear out of character and would not be harmful to the streetscene.

Conclusion

9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed first-floor side extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of Ash Close and, by virtue of its location and the nature of the existing streetscene, I consider that it would respect the context of its surroundings and would not appear as disproportionate or visually intrusive. On this basis, it would not conflict with Policy 28 of the LP or with guidance on residential extensions in the SPD. I therefore allow this appeal subject to the conditions set out above.

Conditions

10. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR