

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2021

**by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 13 April 2021.**

---

**Appeal Ref: PP/L5240/D/20/3264944**

**7 Broadeaves Close, South Croydon CR2 7YP**

- 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 Vinay Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 20/03894/HSE, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
  - The development proposed is the erection of two dormer windows and a ground floor rear/side extension with associated alterations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the erection of a ground floor rear/side extension with associated alterations. I allow the appeal in so far as it relates to the erection of two dormer windows at 7 Broadeaves Close, South Croydon CR2 7YP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/03894/HSE, dated 28 August 2020 subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing P/02 dated August 2020 in so far as it relates to the works approved.
  - 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 host property and the street scene.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey house which is situated in a small residential close. In front of the house there is a detached double garage, next to which there is an open grassed area and a mature tree, which together make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the close.
4. The proposal would include the conversion of the garage to a kitchen, the erection of a single-storey link between the garage and front of the house and

the erection of a large detached garage within the grassed area next to the tree. Whilst not shown on the application drawings, there would no doubt be additional hardstanding created in association with the garage. The loss of the open grassed area in the corner of the close and its replacement by a large garage and hardstanding, combined with the link element, would have an urbanising and harmful effect on the appearance of the close.

5. I conclude therefore that, due to their siting, size and appearance the ground floor extension and garage would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. For these reasons these aspects of the proposal are contrary to Policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which, amongst other matters, require development to respect the pattern, layout, scale and massing of the surrounding area. It is also contrary to the aims of Croydon's Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD).
6. The proposal would also include the installation of a pair of dormers, one on each side of the pitched roof. Whilst they would differ in respect of both their height and width, this is unlikely to be evident in most views towards the appeal property and the larger of the two dormers would not be readily visible from the close or nearby gardens. I am therefore satisfied that these elements would not have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. This aspect of the proposal therefore accords with the aforementioned policies and the aims of the SPD.

### **Conditions**

7. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, where applicable, is imposed.

### **Conclusion**

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the erection of ground floor rear/side extensions but succeed in respect of the pair of dormers. A split decision is therefore issued.

*S Poole*

INSPECTOR