

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19TH October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3155292

26 Hillcote Avenue, Norbury, London SW16 3BH

- 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 and Mrs A Mina against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/00942/P, dated 24 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached dwellinghouse located on a prominent corner plot. This part of Hillcote Avenue predominantly comprises other semi-detached properties, several of which have been extended with two storey side extensions of varying designs.
 4. The existing dwellinghouses has substantial spacing adjacent to its west facing elevation. Nevertheless, whilst the proposed extension would be sited away from the side and front boundaries of the plot, it would be of a significant width and, due to the corner plot, it would be particularly prominent within the streetscene.
 5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (SPD2) advises for two storey side extensions that the original integrity of the design of the original dwelling can usually be retained through a subordinate design. However, the proposed extension has been designed with a front bay section that would be flush with the existing front bay section of the dwelling and the roof line would continue across at its existing height.
 6. Given the prominence of the extension on the corner plot, its width and massing, along with its lack of subservience to the existing dwelling, I consider that the proposal would appear as excessively dominant within the streetscene,
-

unacceptably unbalancing the pair of semi detached dwellings. The resulting impact would be detrimental to be character and rhythm of the streetscene.

7. I observed at my site visit the extensions to other properties in Hillcote Avenue referred to by the appellant. In the majority of cases, whilst being significant extensions, they have been designed to be more subordinate to their host dwelling than the appeal proposal, either by being set back behind their main front elevation or with a lower roof height. In my opinion, the value of a subordinate design is demonstrated by several of these extensions in terms of how they relate to the overall streetscene. Those with less of a subordinate design tend to be more unsympathetic to the streetscene. This limits the weight I have given to these other extensions.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks to make efficient use of land and I acknowledge that the proposal would provide an extended family dwelling. However, this has to be balanced against the visual impact of the proposal which in this case would result in an adverse impact upon the streetscene.
9. The proposed two storey side extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to the design aims of saved policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006), policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013, policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, and the Council's SPD2.
10. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2015. Nevertheless as this relates to heritage assets and archaeology I do not consider it to be relevant to this appeal.
11. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan read as a whole. Having taken account of all material considerations and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR