

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2017

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/16/3162304

5 Holland Avenue, Cheam, SM2 6HW

- 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 Amicus Land & Properties against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref B2016/75196/FUL, dated 18 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of four houses with associated facilities.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the erection of four dwellings on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits on the corner of Holland Avenue and Sackville Road. It is primarily located between Midsummer apartments, a three storey flat roof block of flats, and number 1 Holland Avenue, a detached dwelling. Overall the area is typified by detached dwellings which vary in scale and design. The appeal proposal would be two pairs of semi-detached dwellings. The existing dwelling on site is a large detached house. The main change between this and the new development would be the increase in number and the addition of roof accommodation in the new dwellings.
 4. The footprint and layout of built form on the site would change. The new building would represent a step change. The introduction of roof accommodation would increase the height and scale of the new buildings. This would be compounded by the appearance of the new buildings. The use of large and unresolved fenestration combined with the shape of the roof and the turret feature on one pair of dwellings would appear clumsy rather than an integral part of the overall street scene. Consequently, the proposed buildings would draw attention to the development and appear incongruous within the street scene of the locality.
 5. I note the appellants' point that the area has different dwelling designs side by side and is a suburban area. However, the site is in a prominent location. Approaching from both directions along Holland Avenue it is highly visible. As such the dwellings would be prominent and with the use of the turret feature would appear discordant. Whilst I accept that the scheme would not lead to
-

harm to living conditions of neighbouring properties, would meet secure by design and that it would provide additional dwellings in a location that is generally accessible this does not outweigh the harm I have found to the street scene of the locality.

6. The appellant points out that the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that planning policies and decision should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation. However, it also sets out that '*...permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area...*' and that it is right and proper to seek to reinforce local distinctiveness.
7. I therefore conclude that the erection of four houses would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with policies PMP2 and BP12 of the Core Planning Strategy, DM1 and DM3 of the Site Development Policies DPD and 7.4 of the London Plan in so far as they seek high quality design that is appropriate to its context and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR