The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2023

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3317401
48 Farnborough Avenue, South Croydon CR2 8HD

- 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 Ms Obianuju Philippa de Beneducci against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 22/05046/HSE, dated 4 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
- The development proposed is the erection of two-storey side extension. Erection of hip-to-gable roof alterations with rear dormer. Erection of a new porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice and appellant's appeal form as it more fully describes that for which permission is sought.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The area is characterised by dwellings of similar type and size, some of which have been subject to alteration and extension. I acknowledge that several of these changes include rear dormers, whilst other dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site have had rear dormers that combine with a hip-to-gable alteration. There are also examples of two storey side extensions.

5. Nevertheless, through a combination of houses being set back from their site frontages; the gaps between dwellings; the width of the road; and the central reservation along Copse View, the area around the appeal site offers a pleasant and spacious character.

6. Despite the alterations and extensions which have taken place to some houses in the vicinity of the appeal site, there are few examples which combine a rear dormer, hip-to-gable and two storey side extension. The appeal proposal seeks to do this and as a result would add significant additions to the existing dwelling.

7. The two-storey side extension would join onto the side of the rear dormer that itself springs directly up from the new side gable. This is a somewhat bulky and inelegant solution that emphasises the difficulty in combining these different elements and this scale of extension onto the existing dwelling. In this instance it would cause harm to the building itself and erode the spacious character of the wider area.

8. Although the works would have a limited wider visibility owing to them being to the side/rear, they would nonetheless be visible from the street when passing. The extension would be built in a material to match the existing dwelling. This being so, it would not make the design of the extension acceptable or indeed lessen the harm I have described above.

9. Overall, the proposal would offer a poor visual presentation to the Farnborough Avenue street scene. It would appear as an unsympathetic addition to the dwelling, harming both the character and appearance of the appeal building as well as that of the wider area.

10. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure developments are designed such that they respond positively to their local area and its character.

Other Matters

11. I have acknowledged that there are extended properties in the vicinity of the appeal site. Number 19 Farnborough Avenue in particular incorporates a two-storey side extension, a hip-to-gable alteration and a rear dormer. However, this has been achieved in a way that does not appear to harm the area in the same way the appeal proposals would. Therefore, neither this nor other extensions in the area lead me to allowing the appeal.

12. The front porch was not a contentious matter and based on my own observations I have no reason to disagree. However, the porch not causing harm does not in itself outweigh the other harms I have identified and to which I attribute significant weight.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR