
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2016

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3155689

6 Alexandra Road, Croydon, Surrey CR0 6EU

- 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 Kin Fok against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/00760/P, dated 19 February 2015, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a single/two storey side/rear extension and construction of a dormer extension at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effects of the proposal on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of host property and the street scene; and
 - (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of 4 Alexandra Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with an attached garage to the side. It is situated in a residential street primarily comprising groups of semi-detached houses of similar age and appearance, giving the area a high degree of unity.
4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a part single and part 2 storey side addition with accommodation formed within the roof space. The frontage of the extension would be set behind that of the host building and the roof ridge would be slightly below that of the existing roof ridge. This arrangement would ensure the proposal would not dominate to the host property in views from the road. However the prominent front windows and the unclear location of the proposed eaves¹ would be at odds with the design and proportions of the

¹ The elevation shows the eaves slightly below that of the host building whilst the section drawing shows the eaves significantly higher level.

host property and neighbouring houses. This would result in an incongruous form of development that would harm the appearance of the street scene.

5. At the rear the proposal would comprise 3 storeys, the lower 2 of which would wrap around and dominate the rear of the host property, resulting in a particularly awkward relationship between the existing traditional arrangement of pitched roofs and the boxy rear elements of the proposal. Due to its height, bulk and massing the proposal would fail to adequately integrate with the host property and its surroundings in this respect. I conclude therefore that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
6. For these reasons the proposal fails to comply with Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006) (UDP), which requires new development to respect the context and the proportions of surrounding buildings. It is also contrary to Policies SP1.1 and SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013), which seek new development that contributes to the enhancement of a sense of place and improves the character of an area.

Living conditions

7. The proposal would occupy the entirety of the space between the host property and the side boundary shared with 4 Alexandra Road and it would extend a significant distance beyond the rear building line of No. 4. Whilst this rear protrusion would be primarily single-storey, it would be a tall element evident above the side boundary thus resulting in significant and unacceptable loss of outlook from the rear of No. 4. Due to its height and siting the proposal would therefore have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 4.
8. For these reasons the proposal also conflicts with UDP Policy UD8 that seeks to ensure that existing occupiers are protected from undue visual intrusion. There is also conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document No. 2, *Residential Extensions and Alterations*, which also seeks to ensure that the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers is protected from undue harm.

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