

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2018

**by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 June 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/18/3197527**

**9 Ranmore Avenue, Croydon, Surrey, CR0 5QA.**

- 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 Arti Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 17/05262/FUL, dated 19 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as a two-storey rear and side extension along with conversion of roof space. Demolition of lean to extension, garage and conservatory.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. I understand that a previous design to extend this dwelling was the subject of an earlier appeal. The parties have not provided me with details of either that scheme design or a copy of the Inspector's decision letter. In any case, I shall determine this appeal on the individual merits of the proposal before me.

## Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene of Ranmore Avenue and Radcliffe Road.

## Reasons

4. The property the subject of this appeal, 9 Ranmore Avenue, is a large detached two-storey house situated on a large corner plot at the junction of Ranmore Avenue and Radcliffe Road. The area is characterised by similarly large houses set, as here, well back from the road on large garden plots. As I saw the houses represent an eclectic mix of architectural styles. However, they are generally traditionally residential in their form, styling and detailing.
5. I understand from the Council's evidence that the dwelling has previously been extended with a two-storey side extension, single storey rear addition and a conservatory. The appellant proposes, following the demolition of the small rear addition, the conservatory and detached garage, the construction of a two-storey side extension that would wrap around the rear of the existing dwelling. Although stepped, it would extend across the full width of the rear of the property at ground floor level.

6. The appellant also proposes reforming and thereby raising the roof of the existing house. This would mean that the side extension, already set well back from the Ranmore Avenue façade, would have a lower ridge height set down below that of the proposed main roof. Accordingly, when seen from Ranmore Avenue the side addition would appear as a subservient addition and therefore would appear acceptable.
7. The roof of the main house and the two-storey extension, when viewed from the side and rear, would have the form of a mansard style roof with a number of dormers on its rear slope.
8. Although the flat roof would be likely to only be visible from some locations, its overall form would, to my mind, appear bulky which in turn would render it dominant. It would therefore be unattractive, dominant and thereby harmful to the street scene of Radcliffe Road.
9. The Council is concerned that the side extension would bring the building forward of what it determines to be the building line on this side of Radcliffe Road. However, from my observations, the existing house is already forward of this building line with the detached garage bringing it right up to the boundary of the site. In any case, in my judgement, being a corner plot it would not be uncommon to position the corner property in the development to both address and turn the corner; this often involves bringing it forward of any notional building line.
10. I therefore do not share the Council's concerns about the need to slavishly maintain the building line here. However, I do conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension when viewed from Radcliffe Road, notwithstanding the removal of the existing garage, would appear as an unattractive form of development that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore not accord with Policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 (Adopted April 2013), Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan) (Adopted July 2006), saved Policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015 and Supplementary Planning Document Note 2-*Residential Extensions and Alterations* as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the need for it to contribute to local character.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other large extensions in neighbouring streets. However, whilst I accept that these developments exist, I have been provided with limited information relating to their planning history. Nevertheless, whatever the background, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting the proposed development here. Equally I consider that examples of disharmonious development should not be used to justify further similar proposals.
12. The appellant has suggested that if I were minded to allow the appeal he would be prepared to replace the existing close boarded fence with wire stock fencing and a hedge. While that may be considered a more attractive boundary treatment, it would not overcome my concerns in respect of the design of the proposed extension.

## **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Philip Willmer* INSPECTOR