



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3359356

10 Graham Road, Purley, Croydon CR8 2EL

- 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 Thaddeus Onomor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/03146/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part single/double storey rear and double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling situated within a primarily residential area comprising 2-storey dwellings of varying designs, including a mix of hipped and gabled roofs. Some of the dwellings have been extended, including by side, rear and roof extensions, which are of a modest scale meaning that they are generally subservient additions to their host properties. The dwellings are generally sited to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and, in some cases, used for parking. There are gaps between the side elevations of the dwellings or pairs of semi-detached dwellings.
4. Planning permission has previously been granted by the council for side and rear extensions, a roof extension and the enlargement of the front porch (Ref 23/02854/HSE). Although the full details of this approved scheme have not been provided, the evidence indicates that this permission remains extant. The evidence also identifies that the proposed development would vary from the approved scheme because cumulatively the various additions to the property would be larger, including a 2-storey rear extension with a crown roof to create further accommodation within the roofspace. The side extension would also possess a hipped roof which would be replicated by a change from a gable to a hip roof of an earlier 2-storey addition.

5. Within the context of the streetscene along Graham Road the resulting property, with the hipped roofs above the existing and proposed 2-storey side extensions, would reflect the roofscape of other properties fronting the road. There are several dwellings which have hipped roof forms and the resulting property would not be of such a size so as to result in the loss of the spacious character and appearance of the streetscene. The resulting property would still be sited to the rear of the front garden and there would be gaps retained between the flank walls of existing and proposed 2-storey side additions and the side elevations of 8 and 12 Graham Road. The character and appearance of the streetscene would not be harmed.
6. However, the scale of the proposed rear extension would visually dominate the host property rather than be a subservient addition. The proposed extension would almost double the footprint of the original property, significantly increase the floorspace at first floor level and result in a bulky crown roof which would not reflect the predominance of hipped and gabled roof forms. The scale and design of the proposed extension, in particular the crown roof, would result in an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the host property which would be visible from surrounding gardens and from Beaumont Road through gaps between dwellings.
7. The resulting property would not reflect the more modest scale of other altered dwellings which were observed during the site visit. Accordingly, although not alone a reason for this appeal to fail, the overall scale of the appeal scheme would cause modest harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and adds to the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
8. The unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area demonstrably outweighs the lack of harm caused to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policies SP4 and DM1 of the Croydon Local Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to be informed by its context and be of a high quality of design. Policy D3 of the London Plan (LP) is not of direct relevance because it concerns optimising site capacity through a design led approach rather than specifically householder schemes. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR