
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP(Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3278499

24 Effingham Road, Croydon CR0 3NE

- 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 Suden against the decision of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/01677/HSE, dated 31 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor part rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a first-floor part rear extension at 24 Effingham Road, Croydon, CR0 3NE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/01677/HSE, dated 31 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:

(i)The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.

(ii)The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan N/01, Block Plan N/01A, Floor plans N/02, Floor plans N/03, Elevations N/04, Elevations N/05, Floor plans N/06, Roof plan N/07, Elevations N/08, Elevations N/09, Sections N/10.

Procedural Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021, and this post-dates the Council's refusal notice. As part of the determination of this appeal, the main parties have been afforded an opportunity to comment upon the implications of this change for the purposes of determining this appeal. I have determined this appeal in accordance with the relevant parts of the development plan including the Framework.
3. The applicant is named on the application form and on the Council's refusal notice as Mr Suden but on the appeal form as Mr Sutharsanan Pathmanathan Sudan. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the two names refer to the

same person.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area consisting of mainly two-storey buildings, some in terraces and some semi-detached. Properties have gabled and hipped roofs. The buildings generally follow common building lines behind small front amenity spaces, mainly with low boundary fencing or hedging. There is a preponderance of light-coloured render to walls and roofs are tiled. Cars are parked on both sides of the road.
6. The appeal building is unusual in that, with its semi-detached neighbour, it forms an angled, butterfly arrangement in plan form. It has two storeys with an existing single storey extension to the rear. The proposed development would create a first-floor extension above part of it.
7. The proposal, while being to the rear of the property, would be seen when viewed at an oblique angle from Effingham Road when approaching from the south. However, it would form part of the existing two-storey building and by its comparable height, mass and scale, would form a visually acceptable addition. Moreover, when seen from Effingham Road, it would be viewed alongside the double fronted gable to 28 Effingham Road which has a comparable scale and mass to the proposed extension, making the latter visually acceptable when seen from this vantage point.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, policy DM10 of the London plan 2021, with the Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019, and with chapter 12 of the Framework, all of which aim to ensure good design which accords with the character and appearance of the area.

Planning conditions

9. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR