
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/20/3251438

102 Ellis Road, Coulsdon, CR5 1BZ

- 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 S & E Johnson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/05767/HSE, dated 6 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "*Demolition of outbuilding: Erection of single/two storey front/side extension*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. It sits at the terminal end of Ellis Road, a residential no-through road, but significantly is not part of the wider street scene, being orientated 90 degrees to the conventional run of properties along the road, facing onto a footpath and Farthing Downs beyond, an expansive area of open space designated as Metropolitan Green Belt.
4. The proposal would project the gabled form of the dwelling sideways with a two-storey extension that would be slightly recessed behind the existing front elevation at first floor level. It would also include a forward projecting single-storey element with a lean-to roof over, which would incorporate an entrance porch to the existing front door.
5. The Council is concerned that the proposal would extend the roof of the building by more than two-thirds the size of the original, contrary to advice within section 4.21 of their *Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD). However, this part of the SPD specifically relates to extensions and

alterations to roofs, rather than two-storey side extensions, which is addressed at section 4.17 and which contains no such guideline.

6. Whilst the proposal would inevitably extend the width of the existing building, the resulting elevation would not appear over-wide or out of proportion. In these circumstances the SPD implies that there is no need for a side extension to be set back from the front elevation by the full 1m that is implied as being necessary within the officer's report. There is little symmetry to the existing building of importance that would be affected by the size or shape of the extension. Furthermore, due to the corner location of the appeal site and the disassociation of the plot with the other dwellings along Ellis Road, there is no gap to any neighbouring property that can be eroded and therefore no prospect of any unacceptable terracing effect. In addition, the side extension would not project forward of the established building line on the return frontage to Ellis Road and ample space would be retained to the side of the extended dwelling. Overall, in terms of siting, scale, and massing, I am satisfied that the extension would not have any adverse impact upon the character or appearance of the area.
7. The extension would include a double pair of bi-folding windows at first floor level behind a Juliet-balcony, and a similar set of almost floor to ceiling windows below at ground floor. The front elevation of the extension would be almost entirely glazed. Although the top of the new window openings would align with the existing windows, there would be nothing else in common with the fenestration on the existing dwelling. I appreciate the appellants' desires to enjoy the benefit of extensive views over the adjoining Downs, but the mismatch between the proportions and detailing of the windows on the existing dwelling and the extension to the front elevation, which is exposed to clear view from the public domain, would appear stark and jarring. The result would be an extension that would appear unsympathetic and poorly related to the host dwelling. Although the addition would replicate the form and profile of the existing, its detail would contrast sharply in a manner that would fail to display any sense of cohesion. Overall, I find that the proposal would fail to make a positive contribution to the public realm or display the quality of design that is required to ensure that new development respects and enhances the character of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies SP4 *Urban Design and Local Character* and DM10 *Design and Character* of The Croydon Local Plan 2018, and with Policies 7.4 *Local Character* and 7.6 *Architecture* of the London Plan 2016 insofar as they relate to the quality of design and respect for local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR