



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2019

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 March 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/18/3219708

44 Abbots Lane, Kenley CR8 5JH

- 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 and Mrs Thomas Jupp against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 18/04027/HSE, dated 10 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is two storey extensions and extension to existing crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At appeal stage the appellants submitted amended plans which 1) removed the proposed extension to the existing crossover from the scheme; and 2) altered the size and design of the extensions. I am normally required to deal with an appeal on the basis of the same plans that informed the Council's decision. Nonetheless, and irrespective of the merits of the revised scheme, I have considered whether it would be appropriate to take the revised drawings into account in this case and I have had regard to the 'Wheatcroft' principles including whether amendments would materially alter the nature of the application and whether anyone who should have been consulted on the changed development would be deprived of that opportunity.
3. With regard to the revised drawings which relate to the proposed crossover widening and the deletion of this element of the scheme, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by my taking the amended plan into account in my determination of this appeal and I am proceeding on that basis.
4. With regard to the revised drawings which relate to the proposed extensions, given the substantial differences between the revised drawings and the drawings that were before the Council when they made their decision and on which locally interested parties had been notified, I am not satisfied that the interests of those parties would not be prejudiced if I were to take the revised drawings into account in my decision. I am therefore considering the appeal on the basis of the same plans the Council used to make their decision in respect of the extensions.

Main Issue

5. On the basis that the extension to the crossover has been removed from the scheme and the existing vehicular access therefore would be unchanged by the proposal, I consider the only main issue is the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. No 44 is a modest detached two storey house which retains much of its original character with an attractive roof shape comprising intersecting gable ended roofs and well proportioned extensions to the rear and side. It occupies a modest sized plot with a driveway and detached garage. The proposed development would demolish an existing single storey side extension and erect two storey extensions to either side of the existing house, creating a primary ridge extending across the width of the dwelling with gable features on all elevations and a first floor dormer window to the rear elevation.
7. These extensions would be large additions, significantly increasing the footprint of the existing house and extending the frontages to Abbots Lane along both the front and side elevations over two storeys. The extensions would be built flush with the existing building line, which together with their size and scale, would not make them subordinate in relation to the existing building. The alterations to the existing roof shape would result in gable ends on both these elevations with a uniform ridge height. While the existing front gable would be retained, its contribution to the visual interest of the roof would be reduced as the new roof would be at the same ridge height and would be large and prominent in itself. The use of matching materials would do little to mitigate the scale of the alterations.
8. The increased footprint would almost double the existing footprint of the building. While the appellants have argued that the plot is extensive and can accommodate this amount of development, from my observations on site and the submitted plans, I consider, although it would retain substantial gaps to the adjacent dwellings, it would result in a disproportionate building to the size of the plot.
9. With such large extensions and alterations to the roof that are not subordinate to the existing house, I consider the original character of the existing building will be lost. The resultant building, which I accept would be more symmetrical, would nevertheless be overly large, bulky, out of scale and out of character with the existing building and disproportionate within the modest plot in which it would sit.
10. The prominence of No 44, occupying a corner plot, located at a sharp bend in Abbots Lane, a reasonably steep road, opposite its junction with Zig Zag Road, would make the alterations very visible within the streetscene. However, Abbots Lane is on a hill and No 44 sits downslope of its neighbours to the west and this goes some way to reducing the visual impact of the extensions as viewed from this direction, but not when viewed from the street and properties opposite where the size and bulk of the new extensions and extended roofline would make the house appear overly large and out of scale. When viewed on the approach up the hill towards the corner, the side elevation, while set back from the frontage behind the existing driveway, would appear particularly large

as the road level is lower. This is exacerbated by its corner plot and because it sits forward of the building line of neighbouring properties.

11. With the sizeable extensions proposed, the dwelling would become overdominant and out of character with the built form of the area which, though accommodates variety in the design of the dwellings, is generally spacious with houses being characteristically detached and set back from the road within large plots.
12. I conclude that the proposed extensions would harm the character and appearance of the existing house and surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies SP4.1 and DM10.1 of the Croydon Local Plan, Policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and Supplementary Planning Document No 2 on Residential Extensions and Alterations, which seek amongst other things to ensure high quality design in keeping with the local area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I dismiss the appeal.

Rachael Pipkin

Inspector