



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by P Wookey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/19/3229104

Camden House, The Brandries, Wallington, SM6 7NB

- 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 Camden House Freehold Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2018/01909, dated 22 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 December 2018.
 - The proposed development is for a two bedroom detached dwelling to be located in the south western corner of the wider Camden House site. The proposal provides a private rear garden and a front garden area which allows for a car parking space and area for bin storage and the provision of some landscaping to the frontage. The proposed dwelling will have a fully hipped roof and will feature a forward projecting bay to the front elevation. The elevations of the building are proposed to be rendered with a plain tile roof to reflect the appearance of the surrounding dwellings. Further works include minor landscaping and formation of soft and hard landscaping areas throughout the site plus inclusion of 5no. new designated car parking bays.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the setting of the nearby Listed Building (LB); and,
 - the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Setting of a Listed Building

3. Under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I am required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.
4. Camden House (CH) is a Grade II LB located on The Brandries, dating from the late eighteenth century. Historically it formed one of four large houses situated in Beddington, which would have originally been surrounded by several acres of grounds. CH remains prominent in the streetscape, due to its scale and bulk, and is surrounded by more modest, suburban style semi-detached and terraced development in a cul-de-sac, mainly built during the inter war years period.

5. In the early 1980's CH was converted into flats and it is not disputed that CH has been subjected to a number of unsympathetic developments over the years and the surrounding grounds are unkempt and overgrown in places. The grounds of CH provide communal grassed areas to the side and rear and there is an area of informal parking for the occupiers of the CH flats, between CH and the neighbouring dwelling No 22 The Brandries. Boundary treatment to neighbouring properties consists of a wooden fence and the fence along the The Brandries, partly obscures a bin store.
6. The development proposed would erect a new two storey, detached dwelling to the side of CH, on part of the land currently used for informal parking and the communal grassed area, with the remaining area being landscaped and designated parking bays created. The proposed new dwelling would have a pitched roof, a small garden and hard standing for car parking in front of the elevation facing The Brandries.
7. The development proposed would reduce significantly the open area to the side of CH which gives the LB its prominent and relatively spacious appearance in an otherwise suburban setting. It is not disputed that the surrounding development has eroded the significance of the setting of LB from the wider area. The close proximity of the proposed new dwelling, its modern design and its failure to be subservient in any way to CH would however have a significant adverse effect on the setting of the LB. Further, the loss of a substantial area to the side of CH, which is an intrinsic part of its character, would create an unwelcome sense of encroachment and would have a seriously harmful effect to the setting of the LB.
8. Notwithstanding the effect of the surrounding development on the setting of the LB, the addition and cumulative effect of the development proposed, would further exacerbate the negative impact on the setting of CH. The development proposed would further diminish CH's relationship with the LB's remaining external, original features and significantly reduce its prominent role in the street scene.
9. I therefore conclude that the development proposed would have an adverse effect on the setting of the LB, which would be contrary to policies 28 and 30 of the Sutton's Local Plan (2018) (SLP), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016)(LP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)(the Framework), and Supplementary Planning Document 14, Urban Design Guide 'Creating Locally Distinctive Places' (2008) (SPD), which when read together seek to ensure new development preserves and respects heritage assets. Furthermore, in carrying out my duty under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I conclude that the development proposed would result in a less than substantial harmful effect on the setting of the LB.
10. Whilst I note the appellant contests the weight to be attached to SPD 14, it provides guidance on design principles which are relevant and, in any case, the development proposed would result in significant harm with respect to the aforementioned policies of the development plan.

Character and Appearance

11. The proposed new dwelling would be set back from the road frontage in order to provide a hardstanding for off street car parking and as a result it would be behind the building line of the adjoining semi-detached property and CH. It

would have a deeper front garden than neighbouring properties and within the street scape, whilst not adhering strictly to the pattern of development, it's design would not appear to be at odds with the pattern and style of the inter war period dwellings. However, due to its scale and design which would be significantly different to CH, the proposed new dwelling would appear incongruous in its relationship to the more prominent CH, accentuated by its siting within the curtilage of the LB.

12. The proposed new dwelling would present a blank side elevation facing CH and as a result would fail to make any positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Based on my site visit observations, whilst the scale and proportions of the proposed new dwelling would not jar with the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling and more recent development along The Brandries, given its setting in such close proximity to CH it would appear out of context and overall it would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
13. I therefore conclude that the development proposed would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area which would be contrary to policies 28 and 30 of the SLP and the SPD, which when read together seek to ensure new development is designed to the highest standards, respects the local context and responds to local character, does not cause harm to the setting of a LB and makes a positive contribution to the streetscene.

Other Matters

14. I note that the appellant states the application was not submitted as a formal enabling development using Historic England's guidelines, though it would enable improvements to be carried out to the LB, which have previously been granted permission. Whilst referred to in the appellants submitted evidence, as the appeal is dismissed on the main issues, I have not pursued this matter further.
15. I note that there is no dispute in respect of the effect of the development proposed on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the new dwelling or the occupiers of neighbouring properties, or highways matters. I also note the Council has no concerns with respect to the formalised parking proposals for CH.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Wookey

INSPECTOR