
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2017

by M Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3172212

113 Woodcote Grove Road, Coulsdon, CR5 2AN

- 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 & Mrs Lo against the decision of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/06403/HSE, dated 19 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey flank extension, single storey rear extension. Loft conversion including front and rear dormers and front porch 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 appeal property and on the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large two-storey detached house, set on the western side of Woodcote Grove Road. Woodcote Grove Road is a predominantly residential street and I observed accommodates some substantial detached properties and dwellings. As is characteristic of other properties within the road, the appeal property is set well-back from the road behind front gardens and driveway, and possesses a substantial private rear garden.
 4. The Council has highlighted that there is no objection in principle to further extensions to the appeal property, but that their substantial size as proposed would over dominate the property, with the differing form and design of the separate elements resulting in a poor overall appearance.
 5. I would not disagree with the Council's assessment of the proposals as amounting to substantial additions to the existing dwelling. However, whilst I have had regard to the Council's reference to the need for subservience for the proposed two-storey side extension, I am satisfied that in this instance the insistence on a setback of the extension or reduction of the ridge height would not serve any particularly logical purpose as the resultant dwelling would not create a terracing effect with the neighbouring property. Furthermore I find that the incorporation of design and fenestration details from the existing dwelling within the proposed extension, including the addition of a matching dormer window, and the use of matching materials, would assist in effectively
-

assimilating the extension with the existing dwelling. I have also had regard to the proposed porch extension and consider that this would not appear as a harmful addition to the front of the dwelling, again noting the incorporation of matching materials and detailing. In this respect, I am satisfied that the extensions to the front of the dwelling would not detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene.

6. Turning to the proposed development to the rear of the dwelling, I note that an existing large lean-to style rear extension would be removed to facilitate the proposed development. The flat-roofed single storey element of the extensions would be 6-7 metres in length and extend over the full width of the resultant property. When taken in combination with the proposed 3.3 metre long two-storey rear extension adjacent to the northern boundary, and having regard to the large two-storey side extension, I am satisfied that the accumulation of extensions and alterations to the rear of the dwelling would visually overwhelm the character and appearance of the original dwelling. Furthermore, I find that the overall scale and form of the proposed single-storey extension would appear particularly out of character in combination with the design of the various other elements.
7. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed single storey rear extensions would not be visible from the street, and that the Council has not identified there as being any adverse impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. However, whilst I accept that the visual impact of the rear extensions would largely be confined to the rear of the property, this does not alter my conclusions in respect of the impact of the scale and design of the extensions on the character and appearance of the original dwelling.
8. I am satisfied that the proposed two-storey side extension, porch extension, and front and rear dormers would be acceptable in respect of their design and scale in the context of the area and original dwelling. However, the accumulation of these extensions with the two storey rear extension and substantial single-storey addition would result in a scale and form of development which would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling.
9. I have noted that the Council identified the development to be contrary to Strategic Policy SP3 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013, but as this addresses matters related to Employment, I am satisfied that it is not relevant in this instance. However, I do find there to be conflict with Strategic Policy SP4 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013, and Policy UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013, as well as the Croydon Council Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document No. 2. These policies and guidance seek to advocate high quality design which respects local character both in respect of design and materials, whilst ensuring that extensions should be designed to appear subordinate to the original house.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR