



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 September 2020

by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3255260
49 St Barnabas Road, Sutton, SM1 4NS

- 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 Ashok Garg against the decision of London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/01825, dated 29 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of a detached two storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the area; (ii) highway safety with particular regard to parking; and (iii) whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers with regard to amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is located on a prominent corner position at the junction of St Barnabas Road and Lower Road. The general character of dwellings within the immediate vicinity of the site are typically two storey semi-detached dwellings. Along this part of St Barnabas Road there is a consistent design approach to the semi-detached dwellings, incorporating projecting front gables and bay windows providing a degree of visual symmetry to the street scene.
4. The dwelling would be sited adjacent to the appeal property on the area currently occupied by the existing garage and single storey side addition. The proposed detached dwelling would be wholly uncharacteristic of the surrounding built form and would appear as a contrived and incongruous feature on this prominent corner plot. The proposed dwelling would be narrower than the adjacent properties and the close proximity to the existing dwelling would be uncharacteristic of the gaps between properties. In addition, the first-floor window design would be at odds with the upper floor bay windows that is a feature in the street scene along St Barnabas Road. Taken

together the above would lead to the front elevation appearing out of context in the street scene.

5. Given the constrained nature of the site the proposed two storey deep rear projection would create an awkward stepped side elevation which would elongate the dwelling and would be out of character with the surrounding built form. It would appear hemmed in within the site and cramped within the plot. Given the prominence of the site, it would not integrate well amongst the surrounding built form and would appear out of place in the street scene.
6. Whilst there is variation of built form at the corner plots of the adjacent junction, in particular the block of flats at Benhill Court which is at a higher density, this would not justify the cramped and incongruous appearance of the proposed dwelling.
7. For the reasons above, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would be in conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), Policies 7 and 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan) and the Council's Creating Locally Distinctive Places Supplementary Planning Document 14 (2008) (SPD). Together, amongst other matters these seek that development should respect local context and respond to local character, have regard to the form of a place and the scale and mass of surrounding buildings, provide a high quality design response that has regard to the pattern of existing streets and makes a positive contribution to the street frontage.

Highway Safety

8. The appeal property has a paved parking area to the front of the property and extends to the side of the property in front of the existing garage. The appellant indicates that the frontage to the existing property would be subdivided to serve both dwellings, with one space for the new dwelling. However, because of the restricted size of the front area, it is far from clear that adequate parking could be provided for two separate dwellings within the site. Whilst I note there is on street parking along St Barnabas Road in the immediate vicinity of the site, this is severely restricted by the amount of vehicle crossovers. Furthermore, I observed at my visit that on street parking was congested with limited availability.
9. On this basis, it has not been demonstrated that sufficient off-road parking could be provided to serve the existing and proposed dwelling and therefore I conclude the proposal would result in harm to highway safety with regard to on street parking. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy 37 of the Local Plan which amongst other matters seeks that new development provides parking in line with adopted standards.

Living Conditions

10. The site plan does not indicate how the existing garden would be subdivided between the exiting property and the proposed property, nor the size of amenity space attributed to each property. In any event, given the tapered nature of the existing garden and its narrowness to the west I do not consider that an adequate level of functional amenity space could be provided to serve both the existing dwelling and the proposed dwelling. Whilst I note the site is in

close proximity to an area of public open space this would not remove the need for acceptable provision of private amenity space.

11. For the above reasons, the proposal would not provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers with regard to the provision of private amenity space. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy 9 of the Local Plan. This seeks that residential developments should provide an adequate amount of private amenity space.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge the proposal would contribute to the area's housing stock; however, the proposal would provide only one additional dwelling. Accordingly, any benefits that might be associated with it would be very modest and would not outweigh the high level of harm I have found to the area's character and appearance and also to the harm that would result in respect of highway safety and to the living conditions of existing and future occupiers.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the appeal does not succeed.

S Thomas

INSPECTOR