
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2025

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/24/3350801

1 Elgin Road, Wallington, Sutton SM6 8RE

- 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 AM Building and Management Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref. is DM2024/00589.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of 1 x 1 bedroom detached single dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. My attention has been drawn to previous appeals at the site that involved residential development, perhaps most specifically reference APP/P5870/W/22/3290332. I shall have regard to this background when considering the merits of this scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a small plot of land on Elgin Road. Being situated on the inside corner of a bend in the highway, the site is prominently located within the context of the neighbourhood. Although there is a commercial outlet to the south and a modern dwelling at 4a Elgin Road with an asymmetric zinc roof, the street scene is predominantly characterised by two-storey houses with pitched roofs facing out over the public domain. In this respect, I share the previous Inspector's reasoning that *"the area has a reasonably consistent, traditional residential character"* and the contemporary property is *"separated from the appeal site by the hardstanding and parked cars associated with the car sales area and the highway. Consequently, it is distinct from and different to the setting of the appeal site."*
5. The proposal seeks to introduce a bungalow of traditional style, with roof pitches and materials to match those of 1 Elgin Road. The appellant avers that it has been designed to be subordinate to the host building at no.1, including a lower roof height than that of the existing.
6. However, whilst I acknowledge the different ethos in comparison to the 2022 scheme I find, as did the previous Inspector, that the scale and height of the unit would appear discordant in the context of the surrounds. The street scene drawings show that the development would be clearly visible from the public domain, and to my mind its diminutive proportions would fail to visually connect with the more uniform size of other dwellings in the locale.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to another appeal (3237007), yet this appears to relate to a two-storey development and would not therefore be directly comparable to that before me. In any event, the appearance of other schemes would be a neutral consideration in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. I recognise that the plot size would generally reflect the size and shape of others in Elgin Road and there are larger three and four storey blocks of flats elsewhere in the neighbourhood. Nevertheless, these matters do not outweigh my reasoning that the proposed detached single storey property would appear incongruous on this site.
9. I therefore conclude that the scheme would result in detriment to the character and appearance of the local area. It would contravene to Policies D1, D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 and the Council's Creating Locally Distinctive Places Supplementary Planning Document 2008, which expect new development to be of an acceptable scale and appearance to reflect and respect the existing setting and local context.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other arguments put forward, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR