



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3313688
22 Pollards Hill West, Norbury, SW16 4NT

- 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 Wazid Abdul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/02135/HSE, dated 15 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part 2-storey, part single storey rear extension, dormer addition to both side facing roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, secondly, the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The proposed works to the appeal property would closely reflect changes seen at the adjoining property of 24 Pollards Hill West, which the appellant informs me was permitted by the Council in 2020. Both of these properties were, originally, of similar form and appearance but the alterations to No. 24 have imbalanced the appearance of these buildings in the street. The proposals would reintroduce a sense of balance, to the benefit of the wider area.
4. Furthermore, the alterations that have occurred to No. 24 are, although relatively substantial, proportionate to the original house: the changes to the roof are set back from the front elevation and the character of an inter-War suburban house with complex, pitched roof form was retained. Thus, with similar proposals shown for No. 22, the property would also appear as a house extended in a suitable fashion in relation to the original building and wider area. The set-back of the roof extension means there would not be a dominant or overbearing effect on the area.

5. Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 require, amongst other matters, development to be of a high quality which respects and enhances local character and contributes positively to the public realm, and further requires proposals to be of high quality that respects development pattern and the appearance and features of the surrounding area. As noted above, the proposals would reflect the appearance and pattern of development in the area, and would be a suitable design. Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 seeks a design-led approach for new development. The proposals would therefore satisfy the policies of the development plan, and not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

Living conditions

6. The extensions at roof level would be distant enough from adjoining properties to ensure no overbearing impact upon the adjoining houses. However, the single storey extension would fill in a large open area, close to the rear of the adjoining property of No. 20. There is a change in levels along the road, and No. 20 has a window facing this open area.
7. There is little objective evidence on this matter, but I assessed the matter from observations at my site visit. From what I have read and seen it appears to me that the height of the single storey extension, when combined with the depth and proximity to the angled boundary, and the change in levels, would be imposing on the outlook from the adjoining house.
8. Policy DM10 of the Local Plan requires new development proposals to protect the amenity of adjoining buildings. The impact of the ground floor extension on the outlook from the adjoining property would conflict with this Policy, and hence there would be harm to the living conditions of that neighbour.

Conclusions

9. I have found the proposals are satisfactory in relation to the first main issue, but it is my overall conclusion that the harm arising in relation to the second main issue outweighs that finding. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh
INSPECTOR