



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3309933

44 Ambleside Gardens, Croydon, CR2 8SF.

- 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 Dr Yi Xu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/02103/HSE, dated 19 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing garage/shed, creation of a double storey side extension, and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage/shed, creation of a double storey side extension, and single storey front extension at 44 Ambleside Gardens, Croydon, CR2 8SF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02103/HSE, dated 19 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: AG-R00-PR-101/R00, PR 102/R00, PR 103/R00, PR 104/R00, PR 105/R00, EX-101R00, EX-102/R00, EX-103/R00, EX-104/R00 and EX105/R00.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and the street scene, and;
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of its potential to be visually intrusive, appear overbearing and to overshadow.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property, 44 Ambleside Gardens, is a detached two-storey dwelling set on rising ground, in a residential road. It is one of two detached properties on larger corner plots. The neighbouring corner plot dwelling, number 42, has been significantly enlarged and virtually fills the plot side to side.
4. The appellant proposes, following the demolition of the existing garage and shed a two-storey side extension and a single storey front extension.
5. The new two-storey addition would result in the removal of the existing flat roof to what I believe to be an earlier two-storey addition and incorporate that earlier addition within the proposed shallow pitched roof over the new extension. The removal of the flat roof addition is to be welcomed. The ridge line of the roof of the two-storey addition would be set down below that of the original dwelling making the extension subservient in terms of its height.
6. Overall, I consider the extensions as designed to be a well-mannered additions that would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property.
7. Due to the length of the two-storey addition the house as extended would appear to fill the plot side to side. However, this is little different to number 42, the scale of which is in any case visually diminished due to its corner plot location. I therefore do not believe that the house extended as designed would appear either overly dominant or obtrusive in the street scene or when viewed from neighbouring properties.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue the proposed development would not cause harm to either the character and appearance of the host property or the street scene. It would therefore accord with the aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan (Adopted March 2021) (London Plan) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (Adopted 27 February 2018) (LP) as they relate, amongst other things to the quality of development and the need to respect and enhance the local character and contribute positively to the public realm.

Living conditions

9. Number 44 sits on slightly higher ground than the neighbouring property number 46 to the east. It also sits further behind and to the south of 46. However, given the orientation of the dwellings I do not consider that 44 as extended would overshadow the rear garden of 46 significantly more than the existing house does already.
10. The flank wall of the single storey addition would be set slightly further from the common boundary with number 46 than the current garage. At this point the boundary changes direction so that the gap between the flank wall of the first floor addition to the boundary would be significantly increased. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that the proposed addition would appear so overbearing as to harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 46.
11. Further the main aspect from the rear of 46 is to the south east to the rear of its garden. Therefore, although the side extension to 44 would be located on

slightly higher ground I do not believe that it would, given the general built up nature of the area as a whole, appear significantly more visually intrusive.

12. I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of its potential to be visually intrusive, appear overbearing or to overshadow. It would therefore accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan and LP Policies SP4 and DM10 as they require new development to protect residential living conditions.

Conditions

13. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
14. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR