



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/19/3240181

22 Pollards Hill West, Norbury, London SW16 4NT

- 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 Wazid Abdul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/03078/HSE, dated 2 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear/side extension and alterations of garage into habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development has changed from that set out on the application form. Both parties agreed to the change, and therefore I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and the effect of the development of the living conditions of adjacent residents.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling, located within a predominately residential area. There are detached dwellings to either side.
5. The appeal proposals seek to erect a two storey side/rear extension, that would subsume the existing garage and store. The rear section would include a single storey extension that would link to the existing dwelling, effectively creating a 'L' shape that would wrap around the existing property.
6. The appeal proposals would be built up to the boundary and include a gable to the second storey, replacing the hipped roof on the existing dwelling. I find that the design of the extension would be out of context with the simpler, traditional proportions of the existing dwelling, creating a bulk and mass that would dominate the property, adjacent to the boundary, and appear somewhat strident and incongruous when seen in the context of the street scene, especially against the adjacent dwelling, which is set lower in terms of its site

level and would be dominated by the appeal proposal and its proximity and massing up to the boundary.

7. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the appeal proposals would not enhance the appearance of the existing dwelling and would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) (the CLP) and Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to be of high quality that respects local character and has regard to the pattern and grain of spaces and streets in scale, proportion and mass.

Effect on living conditions

8. The adjacent property (No 20) is at a slightly lower site level than the appeal property, and whilst it has a garage on the boundary toward No 22, there is a window to a dining room on the side elevation. The construction of a two storey extension up to the boundary would reduce the limited outlook from that room and would severely reduce the light available to that window, which is its principal function. As a result, this would cause material harm to the living conditions of the residents and would be contrary to Policies SP4 and DM10 of the CLP and policy 7.6 of the London Plan, which collectively, amongst other matters, states that development should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of residential buildings, for matters including overshadowing, and do not result in significant loss of existing sunlight or daylight of adjacent occupiers.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR