



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2021

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/20/3265742

74 Sumner Road, Croydon, CR0 3LJ

- 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 D Warner against the decision of London Borough of Croydon Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03205/HSE dated 31 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations, erection of two-storey side extension, single storey side/rear extension and installation of first floor window in rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.
3. Appeal APP/L5240/W/20/3264043 is the child case to this appeal and was determined at the same time following the same site visit, however, each proposal is considered on its own merits and the appeal decisions are separate.
4. Since the determination of this application the London Plan 2021 (a Replacement Plan) has been published by the Mayor. This London Plan replaces all previous versions and, therefore, the London Plan 2016 policies that are referred to within the refusal reason are no longer in force. The draft new London Plan (intend to publish) is clearly referred to within the Council's submissions. Three policies from the London Plan 2016 are cited within the refusal reason. Given the nature of the refusal reason, the main issue and the other documents upon which the refusal reason is based it is not considered, on this occasion, that the publication of the new London Plan directly changes the assessment of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the street scene and adjoining semi-detached dwelling.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a semi-detached property which fronts onto the A213 (Sumner Road) within a predominately residential area. Pedestrian access is gained from Sumner Road. Vehicular access is from Lambeth Road to the West, with the curtilage of the appeal site essentially wrapping around

adjoining no. 76, as can be seen from the submitted block plan (74922/02). Whilst there is a mix of flatted developments, commercial premises and terrace and semi-detached dwellings in the area the appeal site is within a row of residential properties.

7. The appeal site currently benefits from a modest, single storey mono-pitch, side extension which is not the full length of the original property and provides the hallway and an office area. The adjoining property (no. 76) also has a modest side extension which further contributes to the overall symmetry seen and shared between the pair of semi-detached dwellings. As it stands the host dwelling, and the adjoining property (no. 76) are virtually identical in scale and massing creating a strong visual connection.
8. The proposal seeks to extend the dwelling, at two storeys, for length of the existing lean-to with a single storey extension to the rear. I find that the roof form proposed presents as awkward which is demonstrated within the 3D imagery submitted. The combination of the roof form and overall massing I find would create an extension which is not subservient to the host dwelling and would be overbearing to it, particularly when viewed from the front elevation. The design, form and massing would create notable imbalance to the symmetry shared between both the host and adjoining dwellings. As a result of this I find that the proposal would fail to respect the host dwelling and would detract from the architectural character of the pair of dwellings. This would thus be detrimental to both the character and appearance of the area when viewed from within the street scene.
9. The proposal would be contrary to Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy SP4.1 which requires development to respect and enhance local character and LP Policy DM10.1 which requires proposals to respect scale and massing and the appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to LP Policy DM10.7 which requires proposals to demonstrate that the design of roof-form positively contributes to the character of the local and wider area. The proposal would also be contrary to the Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019, section 4.21, which states that roof extensions should not interrupt the appearance of the roof when viewed from the street and avoid creating an overbearing appearance.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has raised, within their submissions, matters which are procedural during the original application period such as the timings of application letters (presumably meaning timing of the decision notice itself) and the conduct of the Council. Matters relating to previous applications are of no relevance within this appeal. The information before me is limited and, notwithstanding this, the claims do not impact my assessment of the appeal proposal before me which has been assessed upon its own merits against the Local Plan as a starting point as required by S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
11. The appellant has submitted options for amended proposals (revision B and C) within their appeal submissions, however, it is not within the scope of this appeal to consider alternative proposals nor chose from additional options which are materially different. The original proposal, as considered by the Council, is the subject of this appeal only to ensure a fair, open and

transparent system in which interested parties and the Council can both consider specific proposals upon their own merits.

12. I note a third party comment in response to the consultation for this application. Objections to previous schemes do not fall within the scope of this appeal and potential breach of Party Wall Regulations are a private matter, however, had the proposal been acceptable in other regards a third party wall agreement could have been sought. I note that the comment does query how the proposal will affect their property, however, it does not specifically raise objection.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR