



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3338565

25 The Grange, Croydon, Surrey CR0 8AP

- 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 Andrew Webb against the decision of The Council of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 23/04542/HSE
 - The development proposed is described as 'first floor side extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as 'first floor side extension' at 25 The Grange, Croydon, Surrey CR0 8AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/04542/HSE, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plan reference 2086-01, dated November 2023 and the 'Fire Statement' dated January 2024.

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 main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two storey semi detached unit on a cul de sac of other similar dwellings. Many have been extended in a variety of ways. There is a standardised materials palette which is typical of the age of the buildings and includes render, brick and tile hanging.
5. The extension will not be obvious from the front of the appeal building. It would be seen mainly from the side elevation when approaching the end of the cul-de-sac. There would be minimal alterations on the side in relation to fenestration to accommodate the new extension and so there would be a limited upset here to some of the building's original features. From the rear,

the proposal would be stepped down and would have a hipped roof to match the existing. The lack of a step back from the rear would not be sufficient to state it would display a lack of subservience. The scale of the extension would be, in any case, noticeably lesser than the existing building. It would not project further than the rear of the existing dwelling and the materials used would reflect it.

6. With these matters in mind, the extension would seem a logical and coherent addition to the existing dwelling, such that it would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would comply with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Conditions

7. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and referred to the approved plans for enforcement purposes. I have included reference to the fire statement due to the requirements of Policy D12 of the London Plan. The approved plans show the materials so there is no need for a further condition.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

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 allowed, subject to the stated conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR