



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2024 by C Glaister

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 MAY 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3338879

46 Riddlesdown Avenue, Croydon, Purley CR8 1JJ

- 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 Mr Ernie Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 23/04045/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and front roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and front roof extension at 46 Riddlesdown Avenue, Croydon, Purley CR8 1JJ in accordance with the terms of application Ref 23/04045/HSE subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: the Location Plan (21 June 2023) and the Elevation, Floor, and Roof Plans (Rev A) (June 2023).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted undated Planning Fire Safety Strategy by LPR Design. .

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development on the application form is for a loft extension and the appeal form describes it as erection of a front roof extension. However, the plans clearly show a single storey rear extension is also proposed. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, I have used the Council's description of development in the banner heading above and in the decision as it more accurately describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The property is a detached chalet bungalow. The front features two forward-projecting elements on either side, one with a hipped roof and the other with a gablet. The main roof slopes towards the front and rear and has gabled ends at either side. Most of the other properties on Riddlesdown Avenue are also detached, but there is a very wide variety amongst their size, design, and appearance, and many are two-storey. There is also a very diverse mixture of roof forms, layouts, and roof features, and a high prevalence of front facing dormers of varying design.
6. The front roof extension would have a flat roof in the middle below the ridge of the main roof, a gabled front, and pitched sides. It would intersect with the roofs of the two front forward-projecting elements but sit back behind their front elevations. The resulting part-hipped roof would be similar to others in the street scene.
7. The design of the extension would complement the overall appearance of the property and appear appropriately integrated within the existing roof formation, particularly because of the pitched sides of the roof, its relationship with the front two forward-projecting elements, and it being set down from the main ridge and in from the sides. Although the extension would be relatively large, the roof could easily accommodate it without the balance of the property being overwhelmed or appearing top heavy. In any event, large roofs as a proportion of the dwellings are common in this area, such as on the next door property. The character and appearance of the host dwelling would not therefore be harmed.
8. It would not be necessary for the extension to replicate an existing roof form in an area where roof forms are seldom alike. Amongst the wide variety of roof forms, layouts, and roof features, the extension would appear entirely in-keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Harm would not therefore arise in this respect.
9. The proposed rear extension would be small and have very little visual impact, simply infilling a small corner. Therefore, it would not result in any harm.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Policy D3 of The London Plan (March 2021) which together seek to ensure development is of a high quality, sympathetic to its local context, and positively responds to local distinctiveness with regard to existing building types, forms, and proportions.

Conditions

11. Conditions relating to the commencement of the development and to ensure accordance with the plans provided are recommended in the interest of certainty. A condition ensuring the external surfaces match the materials used in the existing building is recommended to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

12. A condition ensuring the development accords with the Planning Fire Safety Strategy is recommended to ensure compliance with Policy D12 of the London Plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and I agree with the reasoning and recommendation set out above. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR