



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/25/3362033

36 Kingston Avenue, North Cheam SM3 9UD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sean Buxton and Mr Paul Buxton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton
 - The application Ref is DM2024/01633.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the garage and the erection of a detached two storey dwelling with cycle and refuse stores and the provision of a boundary treatment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof, a double storey rounded bay at the front and a single storey addition to the rear. It is situated next to the junction between Kingston Avenue and Molesey Drive. The space between the flank wall of the house and the latter road is occupied by a large garage with a pitched roof.
4. The appeal property and its attached neighbour, 34 Kingston Drive, form part of a handsome group of semi-detached houses of similar appearance. The wider area comprises streets of inter-war semi-detached houses and short terraces featuring hipped roofs and rendered frontages with half-timbering, bay windows and tile hanging. Many of these buildings retain their original symmetrical layout and appearance which is a key aspect of the character and appearance of the area and a matter to which I attach significant weight. I note that the spaces to the sides of many corner properties have been developed over the years to create 2-storey extensions and small dwellings. Some of these, such as 38A Kingston Avenue, the property on the opposite side of the Kingston Avenue/Molesley Drive junction, are detached houses with flank elevations set close to the pavement.
5. The proposal would involve the demolition of the garage and the erection of a 2-storey 3-bedroom house with a hipped roof and a double storey rounded bay with a gable above at the front. These features and the rendered walls would mimic the

appearance of the existing house and the group of semi-detached houses of which it forms part.

6. Whilst the house at 38A Kingston Avenue has an alleyway between it and the side boundary, the flank wall of the proposal would be sited immediately next to the side boundary of the appeal site. As a consequence of this siting, and the proposal's height and massing, it would be a particularly prominent element in views along Molesley Drive. This visual impact would be exacerbated by the curve in the road and the sparseness of built development to the rear of the appeal site.
7. Due to its siting, height and massing I therefore conclude that the proposal would be an overly prominent feature in the street scene and would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site's surroundings. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan (2018) which expect new development to be of an acceptable scale and appearance to reflect and respect the existing setting and local context.
8. I note the examples of dwellings constructed on corner sites in the wider area over the last 30 years. However, as each planning application and appeal must be considered against current development plan policies and on its individual merits having regard to its particular local context, I accord limited weight to these past developments.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR