

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2020

**by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07/01/2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3252329**

**61 Stoats Nest Village, Coulsdon, CR5 2JN**

- 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 J Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 20/01192/HSE, dated 11 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor side extension at 61 Stoats Nest Village, Coulsdon, CR5 2JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01192/HSE, dated 11 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan and Drg Nos: 4043/2 and 4043/3.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling set within Stoats Nest Village, a fairly large, residential cul-de-sac recognised by the Council for its architectural and townscape quality and as a well-preserved example of modest social housing dating from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The estate, which is defined within the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) as a

Local Heritage Area (LHA), is laid out with an approach road, lined with properties to both sides, leading to a central green with dwellings around its perimeter. No 61 is located on the approach road close to the junction with Stoats Nest Road.

4. Although there is repetition to the design of dwellings along Stoats Nest Village, there is variety between the semi-detached pairs, not only in terms of detailing, but also to the width of individual buildings. Whilst I recognise the Council's assertion that there are few examples of properties that have been extended to the side, in my assessment this was principally due to the limited gaps between most semi-detached pairs which afford little opportunity for sideways extension. The appeal property has already been extended at single-storey to the side, and together with its attached neighbour at No 62, appeared to me to be part of a significant minority that would be capable of any such opportunity. I cannot agree with the Council's view that extension in the manner proposed would set any kind of precedent that would pave the way for others to alter the pattern and rhythm of development in the area. There is simply little scope for others to follow suit.
5. The existing building has a symmetrical pitched roof, and both properties are finished with white painted render, as is typical for the area. However, the building is not wholly symmetrical, partly due to the side extension to No 61 but also partly due to the window arrangements to the front elevation, which differ between both properties. The proposed first-floor extension would simply project the existing form of the building sideways, but with a slightly lower ridge line. The materials and architectural style would match the simplicity of the original. The elongated width of the building at two-storey would not be disproportionate or out of step with the size and proportions of other semi-detached pairs along Stoats Nest Village. In these circumstances the Council's *Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* implies that the side extension need not be set back from the front elevation. Although the space at first floor level over the side garage would be lost, the resulting spacing with No 60 would reflect the pattern of development more typically seen within the LHA.
6. Overall, I share the appellant's view that the complementary roof form and appearance of the extension would be appropriately sympathetic and, combined with its relationship with No 60, would ensure that the property's contribution to the distinctive features of the street scene and wider character and appearance of the LHA would be retained. I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area, the significance of which, as a non-designated heritage asset would be unaffected. As such, I find no conflict with Policies SP4: *Urban Design and Local Character*, DM10 *Design and Character* and DM18: *Heritage assets and conservation* of the Local Plan, or Policies 7.4 *Local Character*, 7.6 *Architecture*, and 7.8 *Heritage Assets and Archaeology* of the London Plan 2016 insofar as they relate to the quality of design, respect for local character, and the protection of heritage assets.

### **Conditions**

7. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials that are proposed to be used.

**Conclusion**

8. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

*John D Allan*

INSPECTOR