



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3312564 19 Dunsfold Rise, Coulsdon CR5 2ED

- 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 and Mrs Darren and Frances Hill against the decision of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref: 22/03799/HSE, dated 12 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2022
 - The development proposed is the demolition of extensions and porch. Erection of single/two storey front / side / rear extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is the left half of a semi-detached pair (Nos.17 & 19) which have a symmetrical form with a central pitched feature. The hip-roofed elements to each side are set further back and have a flat roof canopy linking to the garage / converted garage in the case of the appeal property.
4. Along Dunsfold Rise are a mixture of property types, including pairs of semis of the same design as the appeal property and other properties with similar design features.
5. The proposal would create a two-storey side extension which would also project to the rear. Whilst it would follow the stagger of the existing property and be set down, proportionally it would be the widest and deepest section. Additionally, a single-storey element would project to the front beyond the central feature and extend across the extension and existing side element.
6. I accept, as noted by the appellant, that the extent of the gaps between the properties along Dunsfold Rise varies. Due to the lack of regularity and the different house types, it is difficult to compare, however, there is a clear sense of separation with either gaps or garages creating space between the properties. As a result of the proposal only the width of an access path would be retained to the boundary and the visual separation would be derived from the garages to the neighbouring property, No.21.

7. As a semi-detached property alterations to one side will inevitably change the symmetry of the building. Nonetheless, due to the combination of the alterations, together with their scale and the lack of subservience, the changes would be all the more apparent, unsettling the form and appearance of the semi-detached pair.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of other developments nearby which vary in form and, in my view, are not all successful in integrating with their host property or the character of the area. However, in the case of Nos. 7, 11a and 27 greater space is retained within the plot to the boundary. The extension to No.29 is the most comparable, although it is not as wide and is limited to a side extension. In comparison, the proposal would fully surround the property with the extensions being of a disproportionate scale and visually dominant, diminishing the appearance of the original dwelling. The form and mass also affect its relationship with its neighbours and the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area.
9. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policies SP4.1 and DM10.1 of the Croydon Local Plan and London Plan Policies D3 and D4 which collectively seek to ensure developments are of high quality, respect and enhance local character and contribute positively to the public realm.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to pre-application advice provided by the Council in relation to a different property for a similar proposal. Whilst some of the aspects raised are different, fundamentally the Council indicates that the scheme would not be acceptable. Each proposal is to be considered on its own merits and this is not a formal decision. As such it has limited weight and does not alter my findings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR