
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/P5870W/24/3352487

80 Stanley Park Road, Carshalton, Sutton SM5 3HY

- 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 Mohammed Tasleem Sabir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref. is DM2024/00467.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of the existing rear outbuilding and creation of a self contained 1 bedroom house with private garden and access form Anglesey Gardens.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are a) the the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area; and b) whether satisfactory provision is made for a reduction in carbon emissions, sustainable drainage and water efficiency.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey building on the junction of Stanley Park Road and Anglesey Gardens. At the rear of the garden is the single detached garage the subject of this appeal. The street scene in this location is broadly characterised by residential properties of a similar scale and height, albeit with differing design, detailing and external materials.
 4. The appeal proposal would introduce a dwelling of considerably smaller size than those in the vicinity of the site. The diminutive proportions would fail to visually connect with the environs, appearing incongruous within the setting. The site plan demonstrates that the unit would be positioned on a relatively small plot in comparison to those adjacent, with only minimal space from the built form to the northern and eastern boundaries. The scheme would therefore appear cramped and reduce the feel of spaciousness in the area.
 5. I understand that planning permission has been granted for a granny annex under Council reference DM2020/00776. However, this development would have dependency on the main house; it would not involve the formal subdivision and intensification of the plot or the provision of associated works such as separate cycle and refuse storage. Although the appellant contends that the current proposal represents a superior design, the conditions attached to 2020 approval include the submission of a landscaping scheme, which could be formulated to screen the blank wall facing Anglesey Gardens, thus negating any such concerns. Overall, to my mind the previous permission is not comparable to the appeal scheme before me, and does not justify the construction of a new dwelling of a scale and extent that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the locale.
-

6. I recognise that the property is not listed, not located within a designated conservation area nor in the Green Belt. It would be situated in an existing built-up estate, making better use of previously developed land and contributing to housing supply. It would not cause any undue harm to living conditions at neighbouring properties and would provide future occupiers with a good quality of internal and external living accommodation, and no objections have been raised in respect of parking, highway safety or trees. Nonetheless, the proposal remains unacceptable for the reasons set out above.
7. I therefore find that the proposal would be injurious to the character and appearance of the local area. It would fail the provisions of Policies H1, H2 and D3 of the London Plan 2021 (LonP) and Policies 10 and 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2018 (LP), which expect new development to be of an acceptable scale and appearance to reflect and respect the existing setting and local context.

Carbon, drainage and water

8. The Council have included a reason for refusal relating to renewable energy, water efficiency and sustainable drainage measures, albeit that the plans indicate solar panels to the roof, rainwater storage tanks and permeable paving and lawn around the property.
9. I understand the Council's wish to assess these matters at the application stage and what the relevant policies set out. However, I am satisfied that matters of detail concerning the panels, tanks and paving could be the subject of conditions without materially prejudicing the Council's position.
10. I find that the proposal would make satisfactory provision for a reduction in carbon emissions, sustainable drainage, and water efficiency, and accordingly the scheme would comply with Policies SI 2, SI 4, SI 5, SI 12 and SI 13 of the LonP and Policies 31, 32 and 33 of the LP.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above and all other factors, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR