



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2023

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3314759

9 Cator Close, Croydon CR0 0BN

- 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 Ewa Pawel Barczuk against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 22/03954/HSE, dated 26 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2022.
- The development proposed is described as 'construction of side extension and porch reconstruction, partly in the place of the demolished side outbuilding.'

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of side extension and porch reconstruction, partly in the place of the demolished side outbuilding at 9 Cator Close, Croydon CR0 0BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/03954/HSE, dated 26 September 2022 and 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents: #00763872-E3D00A: Site Location Plan; 907/01/A: Existing and Proposed Front Elevation; 907/02/A: Existing and Proposed Rear Elevation; 907/03/A: Existing and Proposed Left Side Elevation; 907/04/A: Existing and Proposed Right Side Elevation; 907/05/A: Existing and Proposed Ground Floor; 907/06/A: Existing and Proposed First Floor; 907/07/A: Existing and Proposed Section AA; and, Reasonable Exception Statement dated October 2022.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a residential area, which is characterised by 2 storey, semi-detached and terraced properties, which are set back from the highway behind small front gardens. The appeal property has a porch projection with a sloping roof. It also has a small outbuilding, which is set back behind the front building line and adjoins the side boundary.
4. The proposed development would extend no further forwards than the existing porch, have a flat roof and adjoin the side boundary of the appeal site. A

number of properties in the locality have side projections that adjoin their side boundaries and such an arrangement would not be uncommon in this area. I acknowledge that the majority of side extensions are generally in line or set back behind the front building line of a property and the proposal would differ in this respect.

5. There are a variety of different porch projections in the locality, including those with flat roofs. Whilst the existing dwelling has a pitched roof to the main house and on its porch, the height of the roof would be no higher than that on the existing porch. The provision of a flat roof would not appear out of keeping on the host property or incongruous in the locality, where there are a mix of front projections of differing sizes and designs.
6. There is an extension on a property a short distance away from the appeal site, which is of a similar design, set forward of the front building line, has a flat roof, adjoins the side boundary and has a similar arrangement of external materials. The extension at 139 Uvedale Crescent integrates well with the host property and is not harmful to the street scene.
7. The proposed external materials would complement the existing dwelling. The use of light grey render above the brickwork would blend in with the main dwelling and reduce the prominence of the extension. The proposed brickwork adjacent to the front door would help to break up the extent of render and provide visual interest. Given that the extension would be single storey in height and would project no further forward or exceed the height of the existing porch means that it would not appear overly prominent nor dominate the existing dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would appear subservient to the existing dwelling and would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and would comply with Policies SP4.1 and DM10.1 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. These policies amongst other matters seek that the siting, layout and form of new development respects the character and appearance of the area and makes a positive contribution to the local character of the area and streetscape.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty and fire safety, I have included a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and the Reasonable Exception Statement. As details of external materials are specified on the plans, an external materials condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would accord with the development plan, as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework that indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A James INSPECTOR