



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2023

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3327032

2 Rochford Way, Croydon CR0 3AD

- 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 Sivalingam Gajendra Prabha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 23/01406/HSE, dated 10 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as adding a rear extension with the existing building by 2 meter X 2.5 meter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the open sunroom. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the utility extension and planning permission is granted for the utility extension at 2 Rochford Way, Croydon CR0 3AD in accordance with the relevant terms of the application, Ref 23/01406/HSE, dated 10 April 2023, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and subject to the following condition:

- 1) The development shall at all times be in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Fire Safety Strategy dated 22 May 2023.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development has been carried out. I am therefore considering the appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It is located in a predominantly residential area of similar properties. Many of the surrounding properties have been extended and altered including by the addition of rear extensions.
5. The rear extension that has been carried out is in two distinctive elements, namely the utility extension and the open sunroom.

6. The utility extension is a single storey flat roofed structure. Its design and materials accord with those used in the pre-existing single storey rear extension. Due to its overall size, scale and siting, it is not highly prominent in the street and it does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. I acknowledge that the extension elongates the property somewhat, however it is not in dispute that there is no harm to the living conditions of occupants of surrounding properties as a result. Given the level of alterations and extensions in the surrounding area, I do not consider that harm is caused in this regard.
7. I observed on my site visit that a reasonably sized, and usable area of amenity space remains following the development. Given my findings below on the open sunroom aspect of the development, this would further increase the amount of available amenity space.
8. In terms of the open sunroom, I observed that, due to its design and materials, this is a rather crude addition to the property. The corrugated sheet plastic roof and the timberwork, when combined with its design, does not relate well to the rest of the dwelling. It appears discordant and causes harm to the character and appearance of the property. This is despite the fact that it is located in a position with limited to no visibility from public vantage points.
9. I therefore conclude that the development, insofar as it relates to the utility extension, does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This element of the development complies with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). Collectively, these policies require that development is of a high quality of design that respects the character and appearance of existing areas.
10. I also conclude that the development, insofar as it relates to the sunroom extension, causes harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This element of the development is contrary to the requirements of Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) as set out above.

Conditions

11. As the development has been undertaken, it is not necessary to impose conditions requiring it to commence within 3 years, that it is carried out in accordance with approved plans, or that matching materials should be used.
12. In the interests of fire safety, I will impose a condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Fire Safety Strategy dated 22 May 2023.

Conclusion

13. The two aspects of the development identified above are clearly severable. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR