



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3327726

46 Ryecroft Road, Norbury, London, SW16 3EH

- 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 Yousuf Gadit against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 23/01215/HSE, dated 27 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2023.
 - The development proposed the erection of a first-floor rear extension, roof extension, including mansard with dormer extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property a two-storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof, dormers, a two-storey front projection and an added single storey rear extension. It is in a prominent corner position and is of pleasing design with generous gardens. The locality was developed in the inter-war period and is characterised by detached or semi-detached houses in the vernacular revival style, set in generous plots with large gardens. The locality is of good-quality well-established residential character and attractive, interesting and spacious appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The site lies within the Norwood Grove Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Policy DM18 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (CLP) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021m (LP) reflect the importance placed on Conservation Areas.
 5. To my mind it is important that the principal design qualities, proportions, and detailing of this property is not subject to over-alteration, particularly at an upper level. Regrettably the scheme before me would adversely impinge upon the original external design of the home, would be excessive in scale, and would detract from the current aesthetics of the dwelling. Even with a relative
-

set-down in roof height the extension would be bulky, disproportionate and lacking in finesse.

6. I appreciate that many views would be filtered or restricted but that is not justified reasoning for endorsing inappropriate design. In any event the scheme would be visible from certain vantage points. The present layout sees the two-storey element almost abut the shared boundary at one corner point to the north but this scheme would elongate a two-storey element with that boundary proximity for a substantial and awkward run. Seen from the road looking south this bulk of building would seem strangely positioned close to the boundary and there would be marked intrusion upon a visual gap which contributes to the local sense of spaciousness.
7. In summary the appeal scheme is too large and lacks necessary subtlety for this important building within this agreeable, heritage designated, locality.
8. Having regard to the foregoing I conclude that there would be conflict with S72(1) of the Act, CLP Policy DM18 and LP Policy HC1; there would not be preservation of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Additionally, I conclude that the scheme would run contrary to CLP Policies SP4.1 and DM10 along with LP Policies D3 and D4. Taken together and amongst other matters these policies seek to secure well designed development which would be of appropriate aesthetic form, protect the built environment, and contribute positively to townscape and the streetscene.

Other matters

9. I understand the Appellant's wish to extend the home and I can see that consideration has been given to a number of matters including the selection of materials and garden retention. I note that neighbours have not objected and some express support. I have reviewed other examples of extensions drawn to my attention although I found none to be directly comparable by reason of location, host property, scale or design and, in any event, I must determine this case on its own merits.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; the development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore, there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR