

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2020

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3250929

7 Chiltern Road, Sutton, SM2 5QP

- 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 Mrs H Moosavi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/02122, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of a detached single storey dwelling with roof accommodation, parking, cycle and refuse storage.
-

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 locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the end of a rear garden on a corner plot of a two storey dwelling which fronts Chiltern Road and has its long return down Bassett Close. This is a cul-de-sac with less than twenty homes fronting it, predominantly bungalows or chalet bungalows. The area has established suburban residential characteristics and is of pleasing appearance with a fairly spacious ambiance.
4. The appeal proposal is as described above. The dwelling would have 3 bedrooms including one within the roofspace.

Character and appearance

5. The proposed dwelling would lie appreciably forward of the adjoining bungalow and other nearby homes in Barrett Close and thus would look out of place. Even if only one parking space was provided, as opposed to the two shown, there would be little scope for frontage landscaping and in any event planting would not negate built form. This building would be substantial and jarring on the eye in its otherwise spacious context. A generally open vista would be replaced by a strangely asymmetrical and poorly positioned sizeable structure. It would appear cramped and, in reality, would be just that, taken within this setting. The size of the plot would be markedly below anything else found in
-

proximity. The scheme would not respond to its streetscene or character context. Regrettably, in summary, the proposal would represent aesthetically harmful overdevelopment of an area of back garden land.

6. Policies 1, 13 and of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they call for protection of character and visual qualities within a neighbourhood. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies.

Other matters

7. Contrary to the Appellant I do see LP Policy 13 as relevant. It does not solely refer to backland development, but rather back garden development - a description which would apply here. I agree that the existing fence run is not ideal visually but one does gain a sense of space beyond it and the boundary treatment could be visually improved without recourse to significant development. I recognise that there would be a positive aspect to providing a further home locally and it would be commendable that this would be energy efficient, offer flexible accommodation, and meet a number of technical and space standards. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR