



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by S Thomas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3245984

22 Esher Avenue, North Cheam SM3 9AY

- 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 & Miss Saunders and Cooper against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/01355, dated 1 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing outhouse and construction of new 4-bedroom house on land to side of existing donor house including extension and alterations to donor house. Extended crossover to provide parking access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice refers to Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016). During the course of the appeal, this Plan was replaced by the London Plan (2021) which was formally published by the London Mayor on 2 March 2021. The parties have been given the opportunity to comment on any implications arising for the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the area including the host property and (ii) highway safety with regard to parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached property located on Esher Avenue. The general character of dwellings along Esher Avenue within the immediate vicinity of the site are typically groups of two storey terraces and semi-detached dwellings.
5. The proposed attached new dwelling would be sited on garden land currently occupied by a garage at the side of the existing dwelling. The angled side boundary means the plot widens substantially towards the rear. In order to fit within the plot, the new dwelling would have a narrow stepped front elevation with the corner of the hip roof removed, with the width increasing towards the

rear. This design would appear odd and contrived in the street scene. Because the proposal would be built in close proximity to the side boundary, it would appear cramped and shoe-horned onto the site. It would be incongruous and out of character with surrounding built form and would fail to integrate successfully into the street scene. The proposal is not considered representative or characteristic of the pattern of development along Esher Avenue.

6. In addition, the new dwelling, comprising two storeys, would project well beyond the main rear elevation of the existing terrace. This would create a bulky and overly dominant building. The fact that adequate amenity space is provided for the existing and proposed dwelling does not mitigate the dominant and harmful effect of the proposal. The proposed design would fail to integrate amongst the surrounding built form and would appear out of character with the area.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan) and the Council's Creating Locally Distinctive Places Supplementary Planning Document 14 (2008). Together, amongst other matters, these seek that new development is attractive, should respect local context and respond to local character, is of a suitable scale and massing to the setting of the townscape and makes a positive contribution to the street scene.

Highway Safety

8. The proposal would provide two off-road parking spaces to serve the existing and proposed dwelling. This would result in a shortfall of two off-street parking spaces against the Council's maximum car parking standards. However, I observed on my visit that within Esher Avenue there appeared to be sufficient on-street parking availability. For example, the area bordering the park was largely free of vehicles and there were no vehicle crossovers to reduce on-street parking.
9. On this basis, I conclude the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm in terms of highway safety with regard to on-street parking. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with Policy 37 of the Local Plan which amongst other things seeks that new development provides parking in line with maximum car parking standards, taking account of, amongst other matters, existing publicly available parking provision.

Other Matters

10. Although the proposal would contribute to housing land supply, any benefits that would be associated with one dwelling would be modest and would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area, and host property. Other schemes cited in the locality are not comparable to the appeal proposal and do not provide a precedent for it.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

S Thomas

INSPECTOR