

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2016

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3163253

186 Norbury Avenue, Thornton Heath, CR7 8AG

- 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 Ms Humairaa Bhyat against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/03661/P, dated 17 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

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 locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi detached home with a long front garden as one of an arrangement of 6 homes set at a semi-circle to the road and consequently sited on a plot which 'fans out'. It is part of an established housing estate which is characterised by broadly similar homes set in lines both parallel and in this semi-circular arrangement relative to the principal roads. The effect is an agreeable one and the neighbourhood is of attractive appearance with pleasing rhythms of buildings and a sense of spaciousness. Almost all the homes are hipped roof, the appeal property being an exception to this have changed to gable ended. There is also a large flat roofed dormer to the rear.
 4. As I touch on above, a key characteristic of the area is the rhythm of the layout of the homes and spaces, and shapes of those spaces, which lie between and around the buildings. A feature of the dwellings themselves is that they are almost without exception simple in front elevational design, roof form, overall shape and window arrangement. Unfortunately this proposal would jar on the eye because it would conflict with these estate and dwelling attributes. The principal problem to my mind is that would simply appear too large and overly complex. This would stem from it being too close the shared side boundary at the front part of the planned new build – thus unduly closing the gap at this key point visually – and from its front elevation being overly complex by reason of the roof, walls, flared shape and window arrangement. The scheme would
-

be excessive at the part where the plots have not flared greatly apart as they do deeper into the gardens. The development would, from the front, look cramped and incongruous.

5. Policy UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) 2013 Saved Policies and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure development is well designed; being sympathetic to the locality, respectful to a building's setting, protective of characteristic layouts and having regard to local distinctiveness generally. I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to these policies. It would also conflict with the parallel objectives of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document No. 2 on Residential Extensions and Alterations. Notwithstanding that there is some compliance with detailed guidance within that document the publication cannot be expected to cover every eventuality and each case must be determined on its own merits.

Other matters

6. I sympathise with the Appellant's wish to increase and improve the accommodation of this property on this relatively generous plot. I can see that pre-application dialogue took place and on the face of it the non-binding advice was followed although it is not clear whether width, and hence proximity to the side boundary, was discussed. In any event I must deal with the appeal on its own merits as I see them. I can appreciate that there is a good argument for a hipped roof, provided it was on a suitably scaled and designed extension, being a solution which might enhance the present scene with its unusual gable end. I note that no neighbour objections were submitted. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
7. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Councils' policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR