
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 23 December 2020

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3260813

87 Fairdene Road, Coulsdon CR5 1RJ

- 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 Y Sharif against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/03071/HSE, dated 14 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side extension and rear extension; conversion of the existing loft and erection of a rear dormer; erection of an outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Fairdene Road. No 87 has a hipped roof and shares a central gable roof projection with no 89, its attached counterpart. These dwellings would have originally had symmetrical hipped roofs but no 89 has had a hip to gable extension and a flat roof dormer extension to its rear. The topography of the site and the immediately surrounding area rises significantly west to east, and also, to a lesser extent, north to south. Fairdene Road is characterised by both detached and semi-detached 2-storey dwellings that vary in style and design. Whilst many of the dwellings have been extended, the character of the street scene remains derived from the generous spacing between dwellings and the relatively consistent set back of dwellings from the highway.
4. The proposed side extension would use matching materials and would be set down and set back from the existing dwelling. It would approximately double the width of the existing dwelling and introduce two floors above an integral garage. This increased width and bulk would appear incongruously out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling. The excessive scale of the side extension would also harmfully disrupt the remaining balance and symmetry between no 87 and no 89. Although a gap would remain between the side extension and the boundary with no 85, such a wide extension would unacceptably diminish the existing spacious character of the street.

5. There would be very limited public visibility of the proposed rear dormer window, the single storey rear extension and the outbuilding. The dormer would be set in from the edge of the hipped roof and would have a width not significantly greater than two-thirds of the overall roof width. The single storey extension would have a modest depth and height. Whilst the outbuilding would have a significant floor area, it would sit at the rear of a large garden and would not result in a cramped form of development. As such, I find these elements of the proposal to generally accord with policy with regards to their effect on the character and appearance of the area.
6. Overall, however, the proposal would be obtrusive in the street scene, unacceptably harming the character and appearance of the area by virtue of its disproportionate bulk and the loss of characteristic space between dwellings. The development would, therefore, conflict with Policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policies 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 they do not result in overly wide or poorly proportioned elevations facing the street. Furthermore, the proposal fails to accord with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it would not be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

7. I have had regard to interested parties' concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with respect to loss of privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. I have also had regard to the concerns of interested parties regarding the effect of the proposal on drainage; highways and parking; refuse storage; house prices and trees. The Council did not conclude that they would amount to reasons to justify withholding planning permission. I have been provided with no substantiated evidence which would prompt me to disagree with the Council's conclusions on these matters.
8. The proposals do not include the use of the appeal site as premises for business or education purposes. As such, whilst I note interested parties' concerns with regards to these uses, they do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

9. 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.
10. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR