
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3270348
122 Chaldon Way, Coulsdon CR5 1DE

- 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 Karl Mckiernan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/06441/HSE, dated 14 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2021.
 - The development proposed comprises raising of the eaves and ridge of the main roof, erection of a rear hip to gable roof extension and side dormer, including a Juliet balcony to the rear elevation and one rooflight to the front roofslope, and erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to raising of the eaves and ridge of the main roof, erection of a rear hip to gable roof extension and side dormer, including a Juliet balcony to the rear elevation and one rooflight to the front roofslope. I allow the appeal in so far as it relates to the erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension at 122 Chaldon Way, Coulsdon CR5 1DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/06441/HSE, dated 14 December 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/01, dated November 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.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interest of clarity I have used the description of development given on the appeal form and decision notice in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey house with an attached garage to the side and a single-storey rear extension. It is located in a residential street and forms one end of a group of detached and semi-detached houses of similar age and appearance that feature hipped roofs and street-facing 2-storey bays. This gives the group a high level of visual unity, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
5. The proposal would include raising of the eaves and ridge of the main roof together with the formation of a gable to the rear and a dormer to the side to enable the provision of additional living accommodation within the roof. The group of houses of which the appeal property forms part have a consistent eaves level – just above the first floor windows – and a similar roof ridge level. The proposal would severely disrupt this unity and the appeal property would be an incongruous and alien feature in the street scene causing harm to, and having an unacceptable effect on, the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
6. For these reasons the proposal conflicts with Policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which, amongst other matters, require high quality design that respects and enhances local character. There is also conflict with the aims of Croydon's Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019).
7. The proposal would also comprise the replacement of the garage with a slightly taller and deeper side addition. This would align with the existing addition at the rear and protrude a similar distance beyond the front elevation as the bay. I am satisfied that this aspect of the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the property or the street scene and therefore complies with the aforementioned policies. As this element is functionally and physically separate from the roof addition a split decision can be made to allow the ground floor addition.

Conditions

8. 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

9. 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 roof level addition but succeed in respect of the single-storey ground floor addition. A split decision is therefore issued.

S Poole

INSPECTOR