



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2023

by L Francis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3322091

1223 London Road, Croydon, London SW16 4UY

- 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 Evelyn Boakye against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 23/00060/HSE, dated 6 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is raising the roof to form a second storey extension, together with the construction of a 4m deep single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant's appeal statement quotes paragraphs 124 and 130 from the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework, which has since been superseded. In coming to my conclusions I have had due regard to paragraphs 126 and 134 of the 2021 Framework, the aims of which are consistent with those referred to by the appellant.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a distinctive 2 storey house, set within a corner plot bounded by London Road and Pollards Hill North. The detailing of the window surrounds, glazing bars, quoins, roof form and pattern within the brickwork all add interest to the overall composition.
5. The area is mixed in character, with the busy thoroughfare of London Road containing many three and four storey Victorian and 20th Century buildings, along with some significantly taller modern residential and commercial development. To the rear of the appeal site lies suburban style development, with tree lined streets and largely two storey semi-detached and terraced housing set within gardens.
6. The appellant has drawn attention to the inconsistent building heights and styles in the area, particularly those adjacent to the site. To one side is a

terrace of 4 houses, all 2 storeys, albeit taller than the appeal site. To the other side of Pollards Hill North, lies a more modern 4 storey building. It is significantly taller than the appeal site. Whilst it is evident that there is no overall consistency in building height along this part of London Road, I do not consider that the presence of taller buildings in the vicinity is a justification in itself for the upwards extension of the appeal building.

7. In terms of the appellant's suggestion that the appeal site should form a bookend to the adjacent houses, from my observations on site, I consider the design of the terrace of 4 houses is a completed composition in itself. The roofs are hipped at either end, and the roof of the central 2 houses forms a gable to the front; in my view it does not require a bookend. The variation in building type and style in the immediate area, along with the relatively modest scale of the appeal site, does not in my view signify a need for a taller building in this location. The variation in heights and styles itself contributes to the character of the area.
8. I appreciate that the proposal would use sympathetic materials and style in terms of the stone detailing, facing bricks and roof finish. Notwithstanding this, the proposed second floor would disrupt the original proportions of the building to the detriment of its overall form and scale. I note the appellant's view that it would not be structurally unbalanced or appear heavier at the top than it does at the bottom due to the diminishing window dimensions as the building rises. This may be so, but the overall effect of the extension would be to harm the existing form and scale of this distinctive building.
9. The Council's submissions indicate that there is no dispute in terms of the proposed ground floor extension. I have no reason to disagree as the size and location of the extension make it subservient to the main house. The absence of harm from this element of the proposal is a neutral consideration in my determination of this appeal.
10. The effect of the proposal would be to harm the character, appearance and integrity of the host building, which I consider contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the effect of the proposed second floor extension would be detrimental to the character of the host building and consequently, the character and appearance of the area. The proposed scheme would run contrary to the objectives of policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, which amongst other things, seek to ensure a high quality built environment.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a site at 72 Sunny Bank, SE25 4TG, where there is an extant planning permission for an additional storey and other alterations to a single storey dwelling¹. I have visited the site, where the extension is currently under construction. It is some distance from the appeal site and has a considerably different context in terms of building type and site layout. I therefore attach limited weight to it as a material consideration and it does not change my conclusion on the overall merits of the proposal.

¹ Application reference 21/05352/HSE

Conclusion

12. I have found that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, as such it is contrary to the development plan read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

L Francis

INSPECTOR