
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/21/3271261

44 Hyde Road, South Croydon, CR2 9NP

- 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 Mr & Mrs Grzegorz And Monika Baranski-Furdal against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/06569/HSE, dated 20 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 19th February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension, proposed garage in the front garden/existing driveway, proposed 2no. roof windows and PV panels on the main roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension, proposed garage in the front garden/existing driveway, proposed 2no. roof windows and PV panels on the main roof at 44 Hyde Road, South Croydon, CR2 9NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/06569/HSE, dated 20 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Elevations 104, Floor Plans 102, Roof Plan 103, Elevations 105, Block Plan 201, Elevations 204, Floor Plans 202, Roof Plan 203, Elevations 205 & Block Plan 101.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an attractive semi-detached building with traditional bay-windowed elevations and a roof form generally in symmetry with the adjoining dwelling. It lies in a neighbourhood which is of established residential suburban character where well-designed homes, along with their gardens come together to form an area of attractive appearance. Level changes locally are
-

marked, adding to the scene, and the side of the street with the appeal property has the homes sitting appreciably higher than across the road. Garages are therefore frequently sited at levels' variances from the main home and with these secondary structures on irregular building lines. The proposal is as described above and the main extension works would be flat roofed of modern design idiom, not least through the intended use of black cladding and black or dark grey framing along with green roofs.

4. The Council is concerned that the appearance of the works would be unsympathetic and incongruous as an addition to the dwelling and thus fail to respect or enhance the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the local area.
5. I noted that numerous homes locally have single storey adjuncts to the side, some original others not, and the vast majority have flat roofs and are of a scale comparable to the scheme before me. Most of these side elements use matching materials but not all. To my mind the 'modern take' on a side room with a garage forward and below is an interesting proposition and not one which would look jarring on the eye. It would be pleasing in its own right and would be more subtle in reality than the plans portray with the main form of the existing property and its neighbour continuing to be a visual entity and stand proud and symmetrical in the streetscene. The extension would be behind the planned lower-level garage and not forward of the main wall of the dwelling, which itself is not out of sync with a broadly consistent main dwelling building line found on this stretch of road. The proposed positioning of glazing off-centre on the planned extension adds a small architectural twist that would not detract from the form of the original building.
6. The proposed rear extension would also be of a reasonable design stance and scale in my opinion; I noted a variety of approaches to rear forms locally in terms of finishes, projections and siting relative to boundaries.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would not run contrary to Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Croydon's Suburban Design Guide SPD 2019 (SPD). It would also not conflict with the 2021 London Plan's Policy D4: *Delivering good design* which replaces, in a similar vein, the now superseded Policies 7.4 and 7.6 cited by the Council. The forgoing policies and SPD all aim to ensure that new development is well designed and aesthetically appropriate.
8. I note the Appellant's points made about sustainability and energy efficiency and this would be a further positive feature of the scheme.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I agree with the latter condition to provide certainty. I see no need for a 'matching materials' condition which is put forward as external materials to be utilised are clearly annotated on the approved plans.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR