



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2018

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3191560
3 Inwood Close, Croydon CR0 8BP

- 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 John Meade against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 17/04518/HSE was refused by notice dated 26 October 2017.
 - The development proposed is a garage enlargement to accommodate a mobility scooter along with motor vehicle.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The submitted plan shows the proposed extension with a flat roof although the appellant's letter dated 2 January 2018 refers to the new addition as having a pitched roof with a hipped end to the front elevation. Given this discrepancy, the appellant was invited to clarify the type of roof proposed. In response, the appellant confirmed by email, dated 2 April 2018, to The Planning Inspectorate that:

"The existing side elevation shows the side view of the porch i.e. a window and a door with a pitched roof over bedroom No.1 the proposed side elevation shows an extension to the existing garage with a flat roof over and the pitched over which can be seen on the proposed side elevation is the existing pitched roof over bedroom No.1."

3. I have, therefore, proceeded on the basis that the proposed extension has a flat roof.

Main issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow that is situated along a residential cul-de-sac of detached and semi-detached properties that are similar in age, style and general appearance. A common feature of these detached bungalows is a forward projection with a bay window and a hipped roof. Although some of the dwellings have been modified to varying degrees, the style of bungalows appears to remain largely inviolate. That the bungalows on either side of the

- road broadly follow a comparable front build line reinforces a general feel of uniformity in the existing built form, which is locally distinctive.
6. The proposal is to lengthen the existing garage by introducing a front extension with a build line that would align with that of the existing frontage projection. With 2 forward projections to the front elevation, the proposal would set No 3 apart from the other dwellings along Inwood Close where the side garages are mostly just set back from the main front wall. The forward projection of the proposed garage would also cause it to gain prominence in the local street scene. In views from the road, the flat roof of the garage would relate uneasily with and thus detract from the hipped roof of the main dwelling.
 7. Taken together, No 3 as proposed to be extended would stand uncomfortably in its particular context. It would unduly disrupt the pattern of existing development along Inwood Close and be obtrusive in the street scene, to the detriment of the area's visual character. In reaching this conclusion, I note that the proposed external materials would match the existing building.
 8. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the local area. Of the policies cited by the Council in the reason for refusal that are most relevant to the proposal, there is a conflict with Policy UD13 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of The London Plan (TLP). These policies aim to ensure that development is well designed and has regard to the form of an area or street. It would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that development should respond to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
 9. The appellant is registered disabled and there would be obvious benefits of parking his mobility scooter within the enlarged garage particularly in terms of access, convenience and security. However, these benefits to the appellant do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.
 10. Reference is made in the Officer's report to the proposal as a rear extension and to its effect on properties on Lorne Avenue and on communal gardens, all of which appear to be errors. Even so, the evidence set out in the Officer's report, taken as a whole, provides a respectable basis of the Council's decision to withhold permission. There is no evidence that a different decision would have been reached had these errors not been made.
 11. I share the Council's opinion that no harm to the living conditions of others would result from the appeal scheme. I also note that an interested party supports the proposal and refers to the high standard of workmanship and the consideration shown for other residents when the appeal dwelling was being refurbished.
 12. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR