



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2021

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3272948

52 Bramley Avenue, Coulsdon, CR5 2DQ

- 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 A Hunt against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/05239/HSE, dated 8 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 54 Bramley Road (No.54) with particular regard to daylight, sunlight and visual impact.

Reasons

The Appeal site is located in an area that is characterised by primarily detached and semi-detached two storey family dwellings with deep rear gardens. The appeal dwelling and No.54 comprise a pair of semi-detached houses with large front projecting gables and narrow vehicular accesses to the sides of the dwellings. Both dwellings have good sized rear gardens which face and rise up to the Northeast.

Together and amongst other things Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) state that proposals should protect the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity and should not result in a significant loss of existing sunlight, daylight or privacy for the occupiers of adjacent properties.

The Croydon Amenity and Suburban Design Guide 2019 (DG) explains that extensions can have a significant impact on neighbouring properties. As such they should be designed to ensure that they do not cause a harmful loss of light, visual intrusion or privacy. With this in mind it goes on to advise that rear extensions to semi-detached properties should be no more than 3.5 metres deep and 4 metres tall.

The proposed extension would span across the whole of the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling. It would be four metres deep and 3.088 metres high, with a flat roof and would project up to the boundary fence with No.54.

The outlook from the adjacent rear ground floor living room at No.54 is already enclosed. This is due to its proximity to the side boundary fence; the shallow depth of the adjacent sitting out area, which is enclosed by a retaining wall along the elevated garden edge; and shrub planting. With the proposal the sense of enclosure would significantly increase in both the outlook from the rear living room and the sitting out area. Due to its combined depth and the height of its flat roof, the upper part of the extension would be visually overbearing. It would dominate the outlook from the rear living room and adjacent sitting out area at No.54.

The proposed extension would be sited to the northeast of No.54 and so would not result in a material loss of sunlight in the rear sitting room and adjacent sitting out area at No.54. It would however result in some additional loss of daylight which would exacerbate its overbearing visual impact. This harm is not something that could be satisfactorily dealt with by the imposition of conditions.

I conclude that the proposal would have a significant and unacceptably harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.54 due to visual impact and associated loss of light. Accordingly, the proposed would conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policy DM10 of the LP and the DG.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR