



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2023

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17 October 2023.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3319872**

**54 The Glade, Coulsdon CR5 1SL**

- 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 Hodgson against the decision of Croydon Council.
  - The application Ref 22\_04900\_HSE, dated 22 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is a new granny annex.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. No.54 The Glade is an end of terrace property which occupies a corner plot with a garden extending along Keston Avenue. The garden slopes up to the rear and due to the topography - Keston Avenue rising up in both directions from The Glade, the garden has a wider visual presence than just the immediate street scene.
4. The proposed granny annex is designed to provide self-sufficient but ancillary accommodation for an elderly relative. It would be single-storey and is relatively modest in size for accommodation providing all the facilities required for day-to-day living. Nonetheless, the proposal would result in a substantial increase in the depth of built form to the plot and in the street scene to Keston Avenue. Whilst the annex would be detached it would be positioned close to the rear of the host property and due to the change in levels, the ridge line would effectively align with the eaves of the two-storey property. Additionally, it would project to the side beyond the flank elevation, forward of the building line to Keston Avenue.
5. Reference is made to an outbuilding to the neighbouring property although this is of a smaller form positioned adjacent to the rear boundary and is not overly noticeable from the road. In contrast, the annex would effectively infill the space between that outbuilding and the host property. While the appellant indicates that the loss of gap to the street scene is c12%, how that has been calculated is unclear and only a small section to the rear of the garden would remain free from development.

6. I acknowledge that the hipped roof form and materials would respond to the host property, nonetheless, due to the topography, and the juxtaposition with the host property and Keston Avenue, the siting of the building would be a prominent feature and appear incongruous in the street scene.
7. The appellant has also referred me to other annex developments which have been permitted and whilst there are similarities in scale and/or the self-contained form the details of their locational context are not before me. In this case, it is the appeal site's setting which means the proposal would be visually intrusive, and each case is to be considered on its own merits. Proposed planting to the boundary with Keston Avenue could provide some softening over time, although a window is also proposed to the north elevation which is highlighted as helping to provide surveillance to the road. Despite the lack of clarity with regards to the relationship with the boundary, neither of these aspects would mitigate the impact of the proposal which would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
8. Overall, I find that the siting and scale of the proposed development would be harmful to the character of the area and as such would be contrary to policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which amongst other things, seek development to be of a high quality, reflect local character and to contribute positively to the public realm and townscape.

### **Other Matters**

9. The Council, in their officer's report, raise concerns in relation to the building being tantamount to a separate dwelling, although this did not form part of the reason for refusal. I have considered the development as proposed for a "granny annex" and acknowledge that the ancillary relationship could also be conditioned. Nonetheless, these matters do not alter my findings on the main issue.
10. The appellant refers to frustrations with the application process and a lack of engagement. I am also aware that the proposal is a revised scheme following an earlier refusal. While it is clear changes to the scheme have been made, I have determined the appeal on the proposal before me in accordance with the development plan, and I cannot directly comment on the Council's handling of the application.

### **Conclusion**

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

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR