
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: 13th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3260974

36 Holmwood Avenue, South Croydon CR2 9HY

- 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 T Rattle against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/03317/HSE, dated 27 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension and garage conversion.
-

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 property is a 2-storey semi-detached house located on the western side of Holmwood Avenue. Whilst there is a mix of dwelling styles on Holmwood Avenue, no 36 forms part of a run of semi-detached dwellings of simple gable ended form. These dwellings have attached garages located to their side that project slightly forward of the main 2-storey façade. No 36 has a staggered front elevation at ground floor level, with a mono-pitch roof that extends from the porch across to the garage. Similar staggered front elevations at ground floor level, due to the forward projection of garages, porches and small scale single storey front extensions, are common within the wider street scene. I have had regard to the numerous examples highlighted within the appellant's statement. These front elevation ground floor projections are not, for the most part, visually dominant in either views of individual dwellings or the wider street scene given their small scale. Consequently, Holmwood Avenue has a distinctly spacious and harmonious character by virtue of the simple form of its dwellings and their set-back from the highway behind relatively open driveways and garden areas.
4. The additional forward projection of the proposal would be out of kilter with the smaller scale of the existing ground floor projections generally found to the front of other dwellings on Holmwood Avenue. Whilst I note that the proposal would project no further forward than the adjacent garage at no 34, it would give rise to a prominent feature that would be significantly at odds with the

current appearance of both the appeal property and the attached property at no 38. It would unbalance and harmfully dominate the façade of no 36 by virtue of its significant forward projection against the simple form of the dwelling. The proposal would also harmfully disrupt the symmetry of no 36 and its attached counterpart (no 38) by causing a more significant and incongruous imbalance to their front elevations. Furthermore, the combination of hipped and flat roof forms proposed for the extension would appear incongruous given the simple gable ended form of nos 36 and 38.

5. As such, the proposal would be obtrusive in the street scene, harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the development would conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which, taken together require, amongst other things, that development respects local character, is appropriate to its context and of high quality design. For similar reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of the Publication London Plan (2020) which requires development to respond to the existing character of a place. It would also conflict with the Council's Suburban Design Guide (April 2019) supplementary planning document which advises front extensions must be designed to respond and enhance the character of the existing dwelling.

Other Matters

6. I have taken into account the appellant's desire to extend no 36 to enable suitable accommodation for an elderly family member to be provided. Whilst I attach some weight in favour of the proposal given these personal circumstances, this consideration does not outweigh the harm identified with regards to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR