The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2020

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/20/3253720
154 Cheam Common Road, Cheam, Surrey KT4 8QP

- 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 T. Webber against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
- The application Ref DM2020/00010, dated 4 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2020.
- The development proposed is described on the application form as a "*new first floor and new ground floor rear extensions to existing bungalow*".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single-storey dwelling that is situated in residential area comprising predominately 2-storey semi-detached houses. To one side 156 Cheam Common Road is set a significant distance back from the road and has an attached single-storey garage next to the appeal site. On the other side No.152 is a lot closer to the road and has a 2-storey flank elevation abutting the appeal site. Due to its setting, siting and appearance the appeal property is somewhat of an anomaly in the street scene.

4. Planning permission was granted in 2018[1] for the erection of a first floor extension plus single-storey side and rear additions. The upper floor element of this scheme would follow the front building line and match the ridge height of No.152 with the single-storey element being set further back from the street next to the single-storey part of No.156.

5. The appeal proposal would involve the erection of a first floor element that would align with the frontage of No.156 and the retention of the single-storey element towards the front of the site. I recognise that, due to its set-back location and the existence of vegetation in front of No.156, the main bulk of the proposal would not be visible in oblique views along the road. However, it

[1] Ref A2017/78348

would be clearly visible in front-on views. From here it would present an incoherent and incongruous juxtaposition of single and 2-storey elements that would relate poorly to the scale and appearance of surrounding houses.

6. Due to its height, bulk, siting and design I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such it fails to comply with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 which, amongst other matters, seeks new development that respects the local context, responds to local character and is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR