
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2020

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3244711
24 Lincoln Road, Worcester Park KT4 8AN

- 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 Marius Simion against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application ref DM2019/00988, dated 11 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a one bedroomed chalet dwelling with one parking space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council is no longer pursuing the reason for refusal relating to highway safety. There is therefore no need for me to take this matter any further.

Reasons

4. The site lies on the corner of Lincoln Road and Green Lane. The two roads have differing characteristics. Buildings fronting Green Lane maintain a regular set back from the road frontage which increases as they approach the junction with Lincoln Road, where the curve in the road leads to a greater degree of open space occupied by longer front gardens to those properties fronting Green Lane and the side garden of the appeal property. The set back of buildings combined with the grass verge along the roadside gives Green Lane a spacious appearance. Lincoln Road in contrast is characterised by a greater variety of architectural styles with buildings set closer together and nearer the road, other than for then end closest to Green Lane where buildings, including the appeal property, are set further back from the road frontage.
5. In views along Green Lane, the proposed dwelling would be seen to protrude beyond the existing line of properties, interrupting the spacious feel that is a positive characteristic of Green Lane. As a consequence, the building would appear obtrusive and incongruous in the street scene. This would be

particularly apparent in views from the north where front gardens are relatively open and the building would be clearly seen. It would be slightly less obtrusive from the south where a mature tree in the front garden of the property on the corner provides a degree of screening, but it would still be apparent that it was in front of the line of buildings fronting Green Lane and harmful to the character and appearance of Green Lane for that reason.

6. I note that the development has been designed to retain a degree of space to the side boundary, and existing trees would be retained on the site, but neither of these elements would adequately mitigate the visual harm caused by the siting of the dwelling.
7. The proposed chalet dwelling would correspond with the siting of the two adjacent dwellings at 22 and 24 Lincoln Road, which are set back further than the majority of other properties in Lincoln Road. The plot size would also be comparable to others in the road. the siting of the proposed building would therefore not appear out of place in relation to Lincoln Road, but this would not alter its harmful effect on Green Lane.
8. The design and appearance of the proposed building does appear somewhat truncated with a busy roof form. However, it would follow the eaves and ridge height of the neighbouring property and would reflect something of its design. There are a variety of building sizes, styles and materials present in Lincoln Road and when compared to this variety, the design of the building would not be so unusual as to be harmful.
9. The proposal would add an additional small dwelling to the housing stock, but that limited benefit would not outweigh the harm identified above.
10. The siting of the proposed building in a prominent and intrusive position when viewed from Green Lane would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and would therefore conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 which require new development to respect the local context and make a positive contribution to the streetscene. For the same reason it would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Document 14: Creating Locally Distinctive Places 2008.

Conclusion

11. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR