



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2020

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3259363

37 Pytchley Crescent, Upper Norwood, London SE19 3QT

- 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 Lee Fieldwick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/01392/HSE, dated 11 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a 2-storey side extension to the existing detached house. This includes the conversion of the existing garage at ground floor to additional living space and to add a 1st floor for an additional bedroom suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a 2-storey detached dwelling located on the north-western side of Pytchley Crescent. There is a distinct character to Pytchley Crescent derived from the consistency of its two main house types, their common architectural details, symmetry and generally uniform spacing. No 37 Pytchley Crescent is within a run of 4 detached dwellings that share similar façades, with hipped and gabled roof forms, painted brick overhanging first floor projections, hanging tiles, decorative window shutters, and bay windows. These dwellings are arranged in pairs, with narrow paths separating each dwelling within the pair, and garages (or converted garages) to the other side of each dwelling. There is a high degree of symmetry within this run of 4 dwellings.
4. Whilst the second main house type on Pytchley Crescent has some notable design differences to the first type noted above, including a catslide roof form, they are also arranged in pairs and have a high degree of symmetry of form and spacing. Indeed, whilst there is variation within the street with regards to whether garages are immediately to the side of dwellings or set further back, the characteristic rhythm of gaps and symmetry between each pair of dwellings remains prominent in the street scene.

5. I note that the proposal seeks to be in-keeping with the character of the existing house by using similar materials, roof angles and architectural details. It would, however, encroach into an important space between dwellings, harmfully disrupting the characteristic rhythm of gaps and architectural symmetry within the street scene. The lack of setback of the extension from the original dwelling, and the consequent lack of a design break, would further harmfully unbalance the dwelling's appearance within the general symmetry of the wider street scene.
6. I have had regard to the existing side extensions and side dormer window extensions within Pytchley Crescent drawn to my attention by the appellant. These existing extensions do not, however, encroach into the first-floor space to the side of their dwellings in the same manner or extent as proposed. I have also had regard to the side extensions at nos 19 and 25¹ Hermitage Road referred to by the appellant. No 19 is a corner plot and the side extension projects towards the highway and does not, therefore, encroach into a characteristic space between dwellings. Whilst the extension at no 25 does encroach into a similar space between dwellings as the proposal, the wider surrounding context of Hermitage Road is substantially more varied in terms of dwelling types and their spacing. This gives Hermitage Road a less distinct character than Pytchley Crescent. As such, given the material differences when compared to the circumstances of this appeal, these extensions have been afforded limited weight in my decision. In any case, I have considered the appeal on its own merits.
7. It is concluded, therefore, that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area by virtue of its detrimental impact on the characteristic rhythm of gaps and architectural symmetry within the street scene. The development would conflict with Policies SP4.1, DM10.1 and DM10.7 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016). These policies, when taken together, among other things, require that development respects local character, is appropriate to its context and is of high-quality design. The proposal would also be contrary to the Council's Suburban Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2019), which advises that 2-storey side extensions should ensure that the existing rhythm of the street, including characteristic gaps between properties would not be unreasonably interrupted. Furthermore, the proposal fails to accord with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

8. Overall, there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, of sufficient weight to outweigh the identified conflict with the development plan, nor do they indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
9. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR

¹ Council of the London Borough of Croydon Planning Ref: 13/03064/P