



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2024

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/24/3339737

127 Pollards Hill South, Norbury, Croydon, London, SW16 4LS

- 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 Usman Qureshi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 22/03070/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “demolition of existing dwelling and erection of three-storey six-bedroom detached dwelling with outbuilding in rear garden and provision of associated landscaping, cycle and refuse storage.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council’s decision notice as this more accurately reflects the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area characterised by short terraces on one side of the road and large detached dwellings on the other. The appeal site is on the same side of the road as the detached dwellings and comprises a single storey dwelling on a large plot. The surrounding area has a suburban character, with two-storey dwellings set behind gardens and parking areas. Whilst the dwellings along Parsons Hill South vary in their individual design characteristics most dwellings have dominant projected gables features and are finished in render and brick. Therefore, there is a pleasing consistency of form, pattern of development, and traditional house design.
5. Three storey residential accommodation blocks with flat roofs are located beyond the rear of the appeal site on Recreation Way. These can be glimpsed from Pollards Hill South in gaps between built form. Due to the topography of the area, they are in a lower position than Pollards Hill South, which combined with the intervening vegetation along the rear of the appeal site, these appear separate from the character and appearance of the appeal site and Pollards Hill South.

6. The proposed development would involve the replacement of the single storey dwelling with a three-storey flat roof dwelling of contemporary design. Whilst the appeal site could accommodate a large dwelling the construction of a contemporary flat roof building would remove any element of a gable which is a key original characteristic of the host and surrounding dwellings. The use of gables contributes positively to the relative uniformity of the street and the loss of this and its replacement with a flat roof dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the local street scene.
7. The Council have criticised the use of materials in the proposed dwelling. However, there is a variety of different brick colours and render in the vicinity. Therefore, I would not regard the materials of the proposed dwelling as being inherently at odds with its surroundings.
8. During my site visit I noted that there were examples of flat roofs along Parsons Hill South, including at the appeal site. However, the flat roofs are smaller elements of nearby dwellings, with the gable features being the more dominant feature. The presence of some small flat roofs does not therefore justify the proposed development. Any consistency of form with the accommodation blocks on Recreation Way would not be readily apparent as they appear distinct from the appeal site context.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character or appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). Together these seek to ensure that, amongst other things, developments are subservient to host buildings and respects the development pattern, layout and siting.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the appellants comments relating to improvements in energy efficiency over the existing dwelling. However, I am not convinced that the proposed design is the only way to provide a more energy efficient development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR