



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2026

by A James BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 FEBRUARY 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/25/3374460

563-569 London Road, North Cheam, Sutton SM3 9AE

- 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 Kemal Koca of EFC Sutton Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2025/00539.
 - The development proposed is for the retention and alteration of a front extension and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the original application and on the appeal form do not match. The parties have agreed to the following description 'Retention and alteration of a front extension and canopy'. I am satisfied that this accurately reflects the proposed development and have used this description for the basis of this appeal.
3. Two application forms have been submitted which have a slightly different site address. 563-569 London Road has been used on the plans and the majority of the evidence, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
4. A front extension has been erected at the appeal site. However, there are differences between what is present on site and the proposed plans. These differences include that the proposed plans show that a corner of the extension is to be removed at the front of 563 London Road. I have based my assessment on the proposed plans and submitted evidence.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located within a traditional parade of shops along London Road. The block of properties on which the appeal site is located has a strong and clearly defined building line. Ground floor level uses predominantly consist of shop fronts with a fascia sign and large ceiling to floor windows. These repeated features are key characteristics of the road and help to create a coherent commercial frontage and a sense of uniformity in the street scene. The shop fronts are broken up by front doors which appear to lead to residential properties above. The properties at

first floor level have a mock Tudor appearance which further contributes to the uniform character of the road. The footway abutting the site is large, open and accommodates benches, cycle storage areas and landscaping, all of which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Across the road from the appeal site, the parade of shops retains a strong building line with a narrower footway.

7. The proposal would introduce a substantial front extension, projecting forwards from the building line along a considerable length of the parade. It would be constructed of a dark aluminium frame and roof panels, with windows to the upper half of the front elevation, and solid panels on the bottom. The ends of the proposed front extension would be made from solid composite panels.
8. Although the upper floors of the host properties would be undisturbed by the proposal, as a result of its scale, massing, and design, the extension would dominate the frontage and be visually intrusive in the wider street scene. Extending across the width of several properties, the proposal would create a stark and monotonous feature, interrupting the visual interest in the repeated pattern of shopfronts and fascia signs within the commercial frontage, and the mock Tudor façades above. The proposed development would also break the current building line of the parade of shops and erode the footway, leading to a loss of openness. Together these changes would result in a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host properties and the wider area.
9. The appellant has indicated that the parade of shops has been through extensive changes. While there are different businesses with varied needs, the parade of shops has generally retained key features including large shop windows and fascia signs, maintaining a coherent and unified frontage. The proposed development would lead to a significant loss of such features. Although glass panels would be included in the extension, small windows above a solid panel would not have the same appearance or visual permeability as large shop windows, resulting in a discordant addition to the street scene. The use of solid composite panels on either end of the proposal would compound this effect.
10. Moreover, the proposed development would surround a door which appears to serve a residential property, creating a tunnelling effect. This is not characteristic of this section of London Road which has front doors which are open to the street. Taken together, these effects would fail to reflect the principles set out in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 14: Creating Locally Distinctive Places, which include respecting the building lines, scale, and massing of the site, encouraging active shop fronts without blank facades, and creating rhythm and harmony with all the shopfronts along a street.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to the relevant provisions of Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016 -2031 and Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, require new development to respond to local character, be of a suitable scale and massing to the setting of the site, and enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing building types, forms and proportions.

Other Matters

12. My attention has been drawn to a neighbouring property referred to as the Tas Restaurant in respect of erecting a front extension. However, I do not have the full details in respect of such works, including its planning history. There are clear differences between that scheme and the current proposal, including the levels of glazing used as well as the overall scale of the proposal, and it is not therefore possible to draw a direct comparison between the two. I have determined this appeal on its own merits, based on the evidence before me.
13. I recognise that the proposed development would deliver social and economic benefits, including providing additional retail space, improved security and safety, and better protection of goods from the weather, all of which would enhance the shopping experience for customers. Nevertheless, these benefits do not outweigh the harm identified above and do not lead me to reach an alternative overall conclusion.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR