



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 MAY 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3336226

71 The Chase, Norbury, Croydon, London SW16 3AE

- 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 Minh Hoang against the decision of Croydon Council.
- The application Ref 23/01925/HSE, dated 17 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2023.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a rear extension with a flat roof and demolition of the garage and erection of a double storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the demolition of the garage and erection of a double storey side extension.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted, insofar as it relates to the demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a rear extension with a flat roof, at 71 The Chase, Norbury, Croydon, London SW16 3AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01925/HSE, dated 17 May 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (insofar as they relate to the proposed rear extension): A100, A101 and A102.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

3. 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.
4. On 19 December 2023, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, as the policies in the Framework that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party and I have made my recommendation on this basis.

5. At my site visit I saw that works had been carried out at the appeal property as it differed from that shown in the existing plans. I note that an application was made for the erection of hip-to-gable end loft conversion, and the erection of rear dormer installation of skylights to the front slope¹. However, details of that application are not before me. As such, I cannot confirm whether it is that scheme that has been built on site. In the event that I am minded to allow the side extension part of the appeal, I will return to this later.
6. The appellant has referred to the Croydon Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted in April 2019. However, on 26 July 2022, the Council revoked the SPD. Thus, in consideration of this appeal I assign negligible weight to it.

Main Issue

7. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. The appeal site is located in a residential area. The distinctive character of the street scene is derived predominantly from symmetrically paired semi-detached dwellings which are set-back from the road and have rear gardens. Most of the dwellings have single storey garages to the side, many of which have been altered or extended with an additional storey built on top of the garage. These extensions are modest in scale and thus properties are still similar in scale and design, maintaining the symmetrical character of the area.
9. The appeal property itself is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling located at the corner of The Chase and Gibson's Hill. It has been previously extended and includes a single storey side extension towards the rear, a conservatory at the rear and a single storey detached garage at the side. As stated above, the appeal property has also been extended via a hip-to-gable end loft conversion and the erection of rear dormer. This presents an imbalance to the symmetrical pair of the appeal property and the adjacent property, 69 The Chase.
10. The proposal includes a two-storey side extension which would be around 4.7 metres wide which would be significantly more than half the width of the original dwelling (at around 6.9 metres wide) and to a depth which would incorporate the existing kitchen up to the rear wall. In combination with a previous two storey rear extension the resultant extensions would essentially wrap around the side and rear of the host property.
11. As noted above, two storey side extensions are not an alien feature in the surrounding area, and some can be found on other properties on The Chase. These are however smaller in scale than the appeal proposal. By virtue of its width and resultant massing the two-storey extension would not appear as a subordinate addition to the host property. Its excessive bulk would dominate the host property and it would appear as an incongruous addition which would be harmful to the appearance of the host property.
12. Furthermore, by virtue of its corner plot location it would be prominent and visible on both The Chase and Gibson's Hill. The sheer bulk of the proposed development would set it at odds with the prevailing character.

¹ Council reference 23/01573/LP

13. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that the proposal has been set back by around 1 metre from the main front wall of the host dwelling, and that the ridge line would also be lower as a result. Also, the design of the roof of the extension could arguably return some balance to the pair of properties given that this would have a hipped roof which would respond to the local character. Whilst these factors help to reduce the impact of the proposal, they do not overcome the harm which arises from the excessive width of the extension.
14. The appellant has drawn my attention to various other extensions in the local and wider area. The most relevant example relates to extensions at 49 The Chase which presents similar circumstances to the appeal site, being a corner plot. Whilst I do not have the full details of this scheme before me, my observation upon visiting the area is that it is of a smaller scale than the appeal proposal. The other examples either are of some vintage or have markedly different site characteristics to the proposal before me. Furthermore, it is also likely that different planning considerations, including the now revoked SPD, would have applied. Moreover, each proposal must be considered on its individual merits.
15. It is common ground that the proposed single storey rear extension would not give rise to any harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the wider area nor would it present any other adverse planning considerations. In short, I agree with the Councils assessment on this part of the proposal. This element would also accord with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) as well as Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). Given that this element of the appeal proposal is severable, both physically and functionally, from the proposed double storey side extension to the dwelling there is no reason why planning permission cannot be granted for this rear extension.
16. To conclude on this main issue, I find that the erection of a double storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This part of the proposal would also conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the LP and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan which amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that development is of a high quality which respects and enhances the local character.

Conditions

17. In respect of the single storey rear extension, I have attached the standard time limit condition (1) and a plans condition (2) for the reasons of certainty. I have also included a condition (3) requiring the materials of the rear extension to match the existing building in interests of the appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the rear extension with a flat roof. However, the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a double storey side extension.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear extension and is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a double storey side extension.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR