

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2017

**by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3187704**  
**16 Temple Avenue, Croydon CR0 8QA**

- 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 David Adade against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 17/02817/FUL, dated 25 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2017.
  - The development proposed is a single/2 storey extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The submitted documents confirm that prior approval and planning permission have been given for a single storey extension in the same form as part of this proposal. In this context, the Council has confined its consideration of the proposed first floor element only.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are: the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours: the effects of the proposal on the existing building and character of the area.

### Reasons

#### *Living conditions of neighbours*

4. The appeal relates to this semi-detached 2 storey house, located in a residential area of similar properties. The appeal site abuts an area of planting indicated as 'Temple Avenue Copse'.
5. The proposed 2 storey rear extension would be sited immediately adjacent to the boundary of the attached house at No 14. The neighbouring property has main windows within the rear elevation, including that within a very shallow projection at ground floor. I consider that the proposed extension would be clearly visible from within the neighbouring property, including within its garden area. I judge that the extension, due to its height and proximity, would appear overbearing and unduly dominant when viewed from No 14. This would have a considerably detrimental effect on the living conditions of those neighbours. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy UD8 of the

Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2013 (UDP) and the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.

### **Character**

6. The proposed rear element of the first floor would have a flat roof and the side element would have a hipped roof. However, the hipped roof would not be symmetrical and the rear hip line would be shallower than the existing roof. In my judgement the flat roof would mean that the proposal would fail to integrate with the existing building. The proposed design of the hipped roof would be visually awkward and again, would fail to integrate with the existing building, and those others within the area.
7. I appreciate that these elements at the rear mean that views of it would only be from other rear gardens and over Temple Avenue Copse, when the trees are not in leaf. However, I find that the appearance of the extension would wholly fail to harmonise and integrate with the existing property and so would be harmful to the character of the area, even from these restricted viewpoints.
8. The Council also refer to their normal requirement of a 1.5m set-back for first floor side extensions, whereas the proposal has a 1m set-back. Had all other elements of the proposal been acceptable, I consider that this factor taken by itself would not have been sufficient to count against the scheme; however, in the context that I have set out, it only serves to make the extension more obvious by increasing its prominence. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character of the area, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013, Policies UD2 and UD3 of the UDP and the advice in the Supplementary Planning Document.

### **Conclusions**

9. I have taken account of the appellant's reference to another appeal (Ref; APP/Z5630/D/15/3006057). However, this relates to a different local planning authority and there is no certainty that the circumstances relating to that case are similar to this one. Therefore, I give only limited weight to this matter.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on neighbours and on the character of the area. I find no other matters which are sufficient to outweigh that harm. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*S T Wood*

INSPECTOR