



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2021

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3269976

122 Holmesdale Road, South Norwood, London SE25 6HY

- 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 Ms Sharon White against the decision of the London Borough of Croydon
 - The application Ref 20/05746/HSE, dated 5 November 2020, refused 17 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition and erection of a single storey side and rear extension and first floor side and rear extension, installation of window on side elevation and rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: -
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property, and the living conditions of neighbouring residents at No.120 with regards to outlook.

Procedural Matters

3. For the sake of clarity and brevity I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice.
4. I saw from my site visit that the extensions have now been built; the external works appeared to be complete with internal work taking place, and therefore this is now a retrospective proposal and I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.
5. Since the submission of the appeal, a new London Plan (2021) has been adopted and policy 7.6 of the previous London Plan (2016), referred to by the Council, now carries no weight. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment, and the Council has advised that policy D3 of the new London Plan is relevant to this appeal. I have had regard to this policy in addition to the relevant policies of the Croydon Local Plan (2018).
6. The proposal includes a first floor extension. The Council have not raised any objections to this part of the proposal and they do not form part of the decision notice refusal reasons. I have therefore assessed this appeal only on the ground floor extension and alterations.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. 122 Holmesdale Road is a semi detached property in a street of similar properties. To the rear a two storey outrigger located centrally extends across approximately half the width of each semi. Many of the properties in the row have single storey extensions off the outriggers, including both neighbouring properties.
8. The extension projects beyond the rear extension of the adjoining property, No.124, and extends across the width of the property encompassing an earlier glazed extension to the side of the outrigger. There is also a flat roofed first floor element to the side of the outrigger.
9. The appellant suggests that the additional footprint would be limited. However, the property has been previously extended, and the resultant single storey element is extensive. With a total depth of nearly 10m from the rear elevation it substantially exceeds the guidance for single storey extensions in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)- *Suburban Design Guide April 2019*. It is significantly deeper than the original right-side flank, and forms a substantial length of mainly blank wall facing towards No.120.
10. In my view, the scale of the projection has a considerable visual presence and does not appear as a subservient addition. While other properties in the row have been extended a similar depth, these extensions are only off the outrigger. In this case, the siting and scale of the single storey projection results in a disproportion addition which is harmful to, and out of keeping with the character of the host property and the prevailing pattern of development.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal is of a depth and form which has an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It fails to accord with the SPD and policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan and policy D3 of the London Plan which, amongst other matters, requires development to respect the pattern, layout, siting, scale, forms and proportions of the surrounding area.

Living conditions

12. At ground floor No.120 has a door in the rear elevation closest to the shared boundary. The single storey extension significantly extends beyond the 45-degree line from this opening. In addition, No.120's outrigger and extension beyond also have windows and a door on the side elevation facing towards No.122, however, there are no details of the layout of this property before me.
13. Notwithstanding this, the extension is off set from boundary and a previous conservatory style extension infilled the area to the side of the outrigger. As such whilst the increased depth and height of the extensions reduces the spaciousness to the side of the property given its single storey form, the separation distance and boundary fencing, I do not consider that it is overly oppressive to have a severe detrimental impact on the outlook from No.120.
14. Therefore, whilst the depth of the extension exceeds the guidance in the SPD, I do not find that it would significantly impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.120 by virtue of outlook, and the development accords with Croydon Local Plan policy DM10.6 which requires that that the amenity of the

occupiers of the adjoining buildings are protected. Policy SP4.1 also quoted in the Council's the reason for refusal, is not directly relevant to this matter as it relates more specifically to respecting local character, public realm and townscape.

Other issues

15. I understand that the extensions facilitate layout enhancements and other improvements in terms of extra accommodation and potential energy efficiencies. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified. The appellant has also raised concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application and that the design of the extension could have been amended. Be that as it may, the extension has now been built and changes to the roof form would not have overcome the reasons for refusal.

Conclusion

16. I have found that the proposal does not compromise the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm I have identified with regards to character and appearance.
17. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding.
18. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

.

.