



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2020

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/19/3241367

51 Penshurst Road, Thornton Heath CR7 7EE

- 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 Mrs Farida Mohamed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/04300/HSE, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining properties, with particular regard to natural light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of 2-storey houses. It is situated in a residential street comprising properties of similar age and appearance. Like many other houses in the terrace it has a small single-storey rear addition. The proposal would comprise a flat-roofed single-storey addition that would extend a significant distance beyond the existing rear walls of the appeal property.
4. Whilst I note that single-storey rear additions are a common characteristic of the terrace, these are generally modest in size and subordinate in scale to the host properties. By contrast the appeal proposal would extend beyond the rear building line of the neighbouring extension and would be appreciably larger than the vast majority of those in the terrace. As such it would be an overly dominant and incongruous addition that would not be sufficiently subordinate in scale to the host property or the terrace.
5. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its siting, height, bulk and rear projection, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore fails to comply with Policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) (CLP) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of

the London Plan (2016) (LP) which collectively, amongst other matters, state that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area and include high quality design. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD).

Living Conditions

6. The proposal would extend beyond the rear building line of the extension at the rear of the next door property 53 Penshurst Road. This would result in some reductions in daylight to, and outlook from, rear windows on the ground floor of No.53, and an increased sense of enclosure within the garden. However, this property benefits from relatively good aspect to the rear and therefore the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.53. As the proposal would be set away from the boundary shared with the property on the other side, No.49, I am satisfied that the same would be the case for the occupiers of this property.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would not result in unacceptable effects on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. It therefore conforms with LP Policy DM10.6 under which the Council supports proposals for development that ensure that the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining buildings is protected. The proposal also accords with LP Policy 7.6 and the aims of the SPD in this particular respect.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above under the first main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR