



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/20/3246237

7 Salisbury Avenue, Cheam SM1 2DH

- 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 & Mrs Gannon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/01785, dated 22 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing residential garage and replacement with new detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

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

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies to the side of an existing semi-detached dwelling (No 7) and is currently occupied by a garage. Salisbury Avenue is characterised by predominantly large detached and semi detached dwellings sat in typically spacious plots with varying plot widths. Generous gaps between properties such as the appeal site are a common feature along Salisbury Avenue which contributes to the spacious verdant character of the street scene.
5. Whilst there are varying plot widths along Salisbury Avenue, the subdivision of the curtilage of No 7 to accommodate the dwelling would create a plot width that would be uncharacteristically narrow in the street scene. Given this, although the design incorporates materials and detailing that reflects the neighbouring semi-detached properties, the detached dwelling would be very narrow particularly in relation to the large scale of detached dwellings in the

street scene. By virtue of the narrowness of the dwelling it would be wholly uncharacteristic of surrounding built form and unduly prominent.

6. Due to the constrained nature of the plot, the combination of the narrowness of the dwelling and the limited spacing to the side boundaries and to the adjacent properties, would lead to the dwelling appearing squeezed in between No 7 and No 9. It would appear hemmed in and cramped within the plot which would disrupt the spacious character of the street scene. The proposed dwelling would be an incongruous and intrusive feature which would fail to integrate successfully into the street scene.
7. I note the previous appeal decision at the site¹. However, the full details of this case including the plans are not before me. Nevertheless, whilst the evidence appears to indicate the current scheme has addressed some matters of previous concern, for the reasons set out in this decision, the scale and proportions of the dwelling in combination with the constrained plot and spacing to adjacent properties still results in an unsatisfactory form of development that would appear discordant within the street scene. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits and on the basis of the evidence before me.
8. I note the examples referred by the appellant in the nearby area where the urban grain is tighter. With regard to the example along Salisbury Avenue², whilst the semi-detached properties are built up close to the boundary with the neighbouring detached properties, these dwellings are of substantial size with wide plots and large front gardens. In respect of the example along Derby Road³ the detached dwelling amongst the regular semi-detached form does not appear an infill scheme but rather part of the built form and does not look out of place in the street scene. In any event, the dwelling and plot are not as narrow as that of the scheme before me. Therefore, these examples are not comparable to the scheme before me and do not alter my view on the unacceptability of the appeal proposal.
9. 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 Policies 7 and 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan). 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 mass to the setting of the site and townscape and makes a positive contribution to the street frontage.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the proposal is in a sustainable location and 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 modest and would not outweigh the harm I have found to the area's character and appearance.

¹ APP/P5870/W/18/3213843

² 55-65 Salisbury Avenue

³ 6-24 Derby Road

Conclusion

11. Overall, the proposal would conflict with the development plan. For the reasons above, the appeal does not succeed.

S Thomas

INSPECTOR