



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13th October 2023

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 31.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3326972

2 Woodland Way, Croydon CR0 7UB

- 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 Mrs Maria Patterson against the decision of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref.23/01450/HSE, dated 13 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is to “demolish an existing ground floor side extension and erection of a proposed 2floor side extension.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance of Host Dwelling and Wider Area

3. The appeal property is a bungalow with additional accommodation provided by two side dormers in the roof. It has a single storey attached garage which has a dual pitched gable end roof and is sited slightly forward of the main frontage of the dwelling. The dwelling has a rear conservatory and a landscaped rear garden. It has a tiled roof and white boarding to the external surfaces of the elevations including the side dormers.
4. The dwelling is set back from the road with a gravelled and vegetated front forecourt area. To its east is a detached house with a side facing pitched roof dormer in its west roof (fitted with obscured glass). To the west of the appeal site is a bungalow.
5. The proposal includes demolishing the garage and erecting a two storey side extension to a similar overall height as the main roof. The ground floor would be a games room and the first floor would be a study which would be accessed via a new staircase from the games room. The proposal would have a dual pitched roof with a gable end similar to the existing garage roof. It would stand forward of the front elevation of the dwelling and extend further back than the existing garage. A ground floor bathroom window would be lost by the extended depth.

6. The proposed development would not blend in well with the host dwelling. It would appear as a segregated add-on to the main dwelling and would fail to integrate with the existing design of the dwelling. There would be an incongruous gap between the proposed first floor and the main roof and the resulting roof profiles, being visually close together, would also be unsympathetic and very varied. The height, depth and width of the proposal would result in an overly dominant extension which would fail to appear sufficiently subservient to the main dwelling. The form of the original dwelling would be lost.
7. The proposed development would be visible in the streetscene and its incongruity would adversely affect the harmony of the wider residential area, making a negative contribution to the public realm.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would seriously harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would be detrimental to the streetscene. It would be contrary to policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and policy D3 of the London Plan 2021.

Conclusion

9. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR