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/20/3253748 108 Foxearth Road, South Croydon, CR2 8EF

- 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 & Mrs Norris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 20/00810/HSE, dated 19 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
- The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor rear extension.

Decision

- The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor rear extension at 108 Foxearth Road, South Croydon, CR2 8EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00810/HSE, dated 19 February 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: Drg Nos 20014-01, 20014-02, 20014-03, 20014-04, 20014-05 and 20014-06.
 - 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 semi-detached dwelling with a conventional two-storey front elevation and catslide roof to the outside part of the rear elevation. The original symmetry to the semi-detached pair has been disrupted to the rear where the attached property at No 106 has extended the catslide roof form across its full width with a dormer extension over. This gives the impression of

- a chalet-style dwelling when viewed from the rear. The appeal proposal would remodel the form of No 108 with a first-floor extension to create a conventional two-storey eaves, with a pitched, valley roof over.
- 4. Chapter 4 of The Council's Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) deals with residential extensions and alterations. As effectively being a part first-floor, part roof alteration, the SPD does not directly address the precise nature of the appeal proposal.
- 5. Although the proposal would extend across the full width of the dwelling and change the rear profile of No 108, there is no significance to the original symmetrical form of this semi-detached pair. This has already been changed by the works to No 106 and I saw in views from the back of the appeal property that some other like styled properties nearby have rear dormer extensions, whilst others are unchanged. Others still are originally designed with full two-storey elevations to the rear. The proposed works would be out of sight when viewed from the public domain along Foxearth Road, and I was unable to detect any uniformity to the rear of properties in the area that was important. The extension would be appropriately residential in scale and form, and would be finished with materials to match the existing, which could be secured by condition in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
- 6. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would display the quality of design that is needed in order to respect the built features of the area. There would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. As such, I find no conflict with Policies SP4 Urban Design and Local Character and DM10 Design and Character of The Croydon Local Plan 2018, or Policies 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Development, 7.4 Local Character and 7.6 Architecture of the London Plan 2016 insofar as they all relate to the quality of design and respect for the character of the local area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed subject also to a condition specifying the approved plans, which is necessary to provide certainty.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR