



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/18/3213071

91 Hartland Way, Croydon CR0 8RJ

- 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 Charles Boston against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 18/03087/HSE, dated 19 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2018.
 - The development proposed has been described as “a 2 floor rear extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form, which is the same as that given on the appeal form. The Council have used a different description, however, neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The site is located within a residential area that consists of detached and semi-detached dwellings. The dwelling at the appeal site is the last building within a string of dwellings that are set back from the road by a consistent distance. Most dwellings of Hartland Way are of similar appearance with dormers to the side and bay windows to the front. Several properties feature first floor extensions to the side which are above older single storey projections.
5. The dwelling at the appeal site is the first of a group of properties that deviate from the consistent building form that exists along the majority of Hartland Way. The existing two storey dwelling features a single storey side and rear extension that has a mostly flat roof with a small element of pitched roof at the front. The materials of the existing dwelling are brick and render to the elevations and tiles to the roof.
6. The proposed first floor rear extension would project from the side of the rearmost part of the dwelling and would replicate the shape of the existing

single storey rear projection, albeit with a small overhang to the side and rear elevations. The extension would have a flat roof and the application form states that the materials of the extension would match the existing dwelling.

7. The extension would be a large addition to the dwelling that would have a bulky appearance due to its scale and flat roof design. The positioning of the extension relative to the remainder of the building, the small overhang and the size of the extension would result in it being poorly integrated with the existing building. The extension would therefore become a dominating feature that would detract from the appearance of the dwelling.
8. Due to its positioning, the extension would be visible from the public domain and, as such, the harm to the appearance of the existing dwelling would also cause the dwelling to have an incongruous appearance in the context of the street. Whilst other first floor extensions have occurred to buildings within the locality, these are not of the same scale and are better integrated with the original dwelling in terms of their positioning and design. Those developments therefore have a different appearance than the extension hereby proposed and do not alter my assessment of the proposed development.
9. For the reasons given above, the development would be contrary to policies DM10, SP1.1, SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 which combine to require that development, amongst other things, respects and enhances the varied local character, is informed by the distinctive qualities and identity of the locality and is of a layout, scale, massing and appearance that respects the surroundings. Furthermore, the proposal conflicts with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document No. 2 - Residential Extensions and Alterations (adopted 6 December 2006) which requires side extensions to respect the character of the street and the architectural rhythm.
10. The proposal would also be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016) which require that development has regard to the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings, utilises the highest architectural quality and complements local character.

Conclusion

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

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR