



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2024 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 APRIL 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3335298

65 Pollards Hill North, Norbury, Croydon, London, SW16 4NR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Susan Butler against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 23/03439/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Demolition of existing garage and erection of double storey side extension. Removal of 1x tree'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two storey semi detached dwelling with a gable roof. This has departed from the adjoined neighbour's hip but appears to be so as the result of an attic space conversion. The wider area is defined by similar sized dwellings which are mainly semis. There are some detached examples. There is a pleasant consistency to the size, scale and siting of built form in the area which contributes positively to its character and appearance. This is reinforced by, where they exist, extensions being subservient and following the form and materials of the host dwelling.
5. The use of a hipped roof to the proposed extension would suit the adjoined neighbour but jar awkwardly with the building to which it would be attached. Additionally, the form of the proposed development would be excessively wide, creating the impression of another dwelling. In each instance, the proposed extension would fail to respect the form, scale and design of its host and appear overly dominant. This would, in turn, be unreflective of the quality of the area's consistency.
6. The proposal would be similar in width to the existing garages and a setback from the frontage of the house would be incorporated. However, the

cumulative effect of the width taken with the height of the proposal would result in the above harm. Such that the scheme would fail to comply with Policies SP4.1, DM10.1, DM10.7 of The Croydon Local Plan (2018), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), and the relevant design quality and suitability paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework).

Other Matters

7. The significant difference between the appeal scheme and the perceived precedents, some of which I was able to view at my site visit, is that they involve two storey extensions that both match the style of the existing roof of the host dwelling and are sufficiently subservient. Regardless, each scheme for new development is decided on its own merits with regard to their own specific context. Therefore, I am not led to recommending allowing the appeal in their light. I am also mindful of the proposals being acceptable in other regards, but a lack of harm cannot be used to weigh against harm. It is accordingly a neutral matter.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR