



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by **J D Westbrook BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/25/3367835

300b Croydon Road, Wallington, Sutton, SM6 7LQ

- 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 Vyacheslav Makaravichyus against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2025/00228
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a part three-, part four-storey detached building comprising 8 self-contained residential units with car parking bays to the front and provision of detached cycle and refuse stores.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed building on the character and appearance of Croydon Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow situated on the northern side of Croydon Road. It is set well back from the road within a long, relatively thin site. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the bungalow and the erection of a 4-storey block of 8 flats on a similar footprint to that of the bungalow. There would be a 3-storey extension to the western side of the building containing staircases. There would also be 6 parking spaces to the front of the building and a large communal area to the rear. The building would be a little under 13 metres high, around 14 metres deep and around 12 metres wide.
4. Policy D3 of the London Plan indicates that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach, which requires consideration of design options to determine the most appropriate form of development that responds to a site's context.
5. Policy 28 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (LP) indicates that the Council will grant planning permission for new development provided it is attractive and designed to the highest standard; respects the local context and responds to local character; and is of a suitable scale, massing and height to the setting of the site and/or townscape. In addition, taller buildings (4 storeys or above) will be expected to be of exemplar design and make a positive contribution to the quality of the local and wider townscape, and integrate visually with the townscape and streetscape.

6. The Council contends that the development by reason of its height, depth, scale and massing, cramped nature, general design and conflict with its immediate surroundings, would not respect the character or urban grain of the surrounding area in terms of layout, density or design. In addition, it would not be of exemplar design and would fail to successfully integrate within the streetscape.
7. The section of Croydon Road in the vicinity of the appeal site is a busy residential road. The southern side of the road comprises mainly large, two-storey detached and semi-detached houses. On the northern side, there is more variety of dwellings with some flats and 3-storey houses. To the west of the appeal site, No 302 is a 3-storey house with a basement floor below and with the 3rd floor partially contained within the hipped roof. To the east of the site is the small estate of Bloxworth Close, which includes two-storey houses to the rear and 3/4-storey flats in two blocks to the front, facing Croydon Road. A car park serving Bloxworth Close flats is sited between the appeal site and the flats, leaving a view from Croydon Road to the two-storey houses at the rear.
8. From the submitted drawings, it would appear that No 302 has a height of a little under 13 metres to the roof ridge. The two-storey houses at the rear of Bloxworth Close would have a ridge height of around 8 metres, and the flats at Bloxworth Close would have ridge heights of a little under 11 metres for the 3-storey elements, and 13 metres for the 4-storey elements. The proposed flats at the appeal site would have a height of just under 13 metres, matching that of No 302.
9. I acknowledge that the existing bungalow on the site appears incongruous in the current street scene, and the Council, in November 2024, granted planning permission (Ref: DM2024/00238) for a 3-storey block of flats on the appeal site to replace it. In my opinion, the permitted 3-storey block, with a lower roof ridge, would create a greater sense of balance in the street scene, marking a transition from the height of No 302 down to the height of the 2-storey houses at Bloxworth Close, and mirroring the 3-storey element at the west of the flats at Bloxworth Close, which provides a visual 'step-up' to the attached 4-storey element.
10. By way of contrast, the proposed 4-storey block at the appeal site would also appear incongruous in the street scene. Whilst it would not be higher than the neighbouring No 302, it would have a full 4 storeys with a very low roof pitch. Given the narrowness of the plot, this arrangement would result in the block having an over-dominant verticality with an uncharacteristic shallow roofline.
11. The appellant makes note of the existence of a large block of flats at No 324 Croydon Road, and the 4-storey nature of part of the Bloxworth Close estate. With regard to No 324, this is a 3-storey block of flats, set well back from the road and partially screened by houses that are set closer to the road. In addition the 3rd storey is set within a mansard roof such that the building appears little taller than the surrounding houses. It integrates well within the streetscape.
12. With regard to the flats at Bloxworth Close, the 4th storey element in both blocks is designed to be contained within a significant roof space which itself has a half-hipped front elevation. This reduces the apparent bulk and allows the 3-storey sections to integrate across the flats, and also with the smaller houses to the rear. The proposed block at the appeal site would not adopt exemplar design techniques, and would fail to successfully integrate within the streetscape in the way that nearby developments have done.

Other Matter

13. The appellant has submitted a viability statement which concludes that the already permitted 3-storey, 6 apartment block would not be profit making, and that it would be necessary to construct a 4-storey, 8 apartment block in order to be viable. However, the 3-storey block was granted permission only a very short time before the current scheme was submitted, and I have no information as to why the financial situation changed so significantly so soon after the earlier permission, which I presume to have been considered viable at the time. In any event, I have no financial details before me relating to any other versions of a 4-storey block which could have a more sympathetic design, and the submitted design is unsatisfactory by way of not respecting the character or urban grain of the surrounding area, and by failing to integrate well into the existing street-scene.

Conclusion

14. In conclusion, I consider that, in this case, the scale of the proposed block would not respect the context of the surrounding pattern of development. The significant height, coupled with the excessive verticality caused by the narrow plot and the unsympathetic roof design, would result in a building that would be prominent in the streetscene, and which would be uncharacteristic of the surrounding area. In the light of this, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Croydon Road. It would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan and with Policy 28 of the LP and, accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR