

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3276326

31 The Drive, Coulsdon, CR5 2BL

- 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 Neil Bajaj against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/00502/HSE, dated 1 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is an ancillary detached outbuilding with multifunction room/gym and shower and home office space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow on a plot which is appreciably lower than road level. The wider area is of generally traditional suburban established residential character where homes and, usually spacious, front gardens combine to create a locality of pleasing appearance. The outbuilding would be sited forward of the main dwelling and would be a 1.5 storey detached structure with dimensions about 5.4 metres in depth, 9.6m in width, 2.9m to eaves and with ridge height of 5.9m. It would include two dormer windows.
 4. As I touch on above a general characteristic of the area is the broad lack of any significant built development close to the road; there is a sense of spaciousness which contributes towards the good quality character which prevails. The appeal scheme would run contrary to this pattern. Even with the level of the appeal site being below the norm for the area to have a building to the front of the home at broadly the same ridge height, with the very significant bulk proposed, and with a dormer window design, would not appear as an ancillary outbuilding subservient in the scene. This excessive structure would look out of place and this would be compounded as it would be in such uncharacteristically close proximity to the highway. The scheme would be very ill-at-ease visually.
-

5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), and Croydon's Suburban Design Guide SPD 2019 (SPD) which all aim to ensure that new development is well designed and aesthetically appropriate.

Other matters

6. I do understand the Appellant's wish to increase accommodation on this site and I can see that design and selection of materials has been drawn from the main property. I appreciate that level differences need to be taken into account in any assessment; I visited the site and fully appreciate the lie of the land. I have considered other development highlighted locally but by reason of setting and site details this is not comparable to the case in hand. I see a continuing need for good design at the property and in the locality and I must deal with this appeal scheme on its own merits.
7. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. Key objectives of the document are to safeguard qualities of the built environment and the development plan policies and guidance to which I refer mirror this.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR