



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by **N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3354678

9 Chestnut Grove, Croydon, South Croydon CR2 7LL

- 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 Andrea Natsi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application ref is 24/01831/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as: Erection of front porch, single/two-storey wraparound extension, erection of rear dormer, installation of a rooflight at front roof slope, and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal form indicates that the description of development has changed. I have therefore used the amended description within the banner heading.
3. Appeal APP/L5240/D/24/3354680 is for a similar extension at 7 Chestnut Grove (No 7). The appellant indicates that the developments proposed in both this appeal and at No 7 would be carried out simultaneously. Nonetheless, I have not been presented with a completed planning obligation to ensure both appeal developments would be carried out as a single scheme. As such, I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the area; and
 - Living conditions of the occupiers of No 7 with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property forms a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The properties along the northern section of this part of Chestnut Grove comprise well-proportioned pairs of two-storey semi-detached dwellings generously set back from the highway, with the appeal property reflective of this. There are examples of two storey extensions disrupting the symmetry of the pair, most notably 5 Chestnut Grove. Nonetheless, these pairs are predominantly similar in their form and design, giving the street scene a pleasing rhythm. Their hipped roofs and

appreciable gap between the side elevations above ground floor level creates an openness between the majority of the pairs of dwellings, giving the street scene a spacious character.

6. The appeal property, including that of the adjoining dwelling, appears relatively unaltered above ground floor level giving the pair a symmetry that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The absence of a side extension at first-floor level in combination with its hipped roof creates a sizable visual gap between the first-floor side elevation of the appeal property and that of No 7, contributing to the aforementioned spaciousness of the street scene.
7. The proposed side extension would unbalance the existing symmetry with the adjoining dwelling, harming this quality of the area. Further, the proposal would intrude on the existing gap between the appeal dwelling and No 7, with the use of a barn hipped roof further increasing its visual bulk. As such, the proposed side extension would erode the existing spacious relationship with No 7, harming its contribution to the openness of the street scene. Further, the use of a barn hipped roof would appear out of character with the hipped roofs of the majority of the surrounding dwellings that form a strong feature of the area.
8. The degree of setback of the front elevations from first-floor extensions varies within the area. The ridge line of the proposal would be stepped down slightly below that of the host dwelling with the first-floor front elevation set back minimally. When this minor setback is combined with the additional visual bulk of the barn hipped roof, the proposal would appear dominant, disrupting the proportions of the host dwelling. This bulk is exacerbated to the rear elevation by the proposed two-storey projection.
9. The appellant raises a few examples of barn hipped roofs, narrow gaps between dwellings, and dwellings that vary in style. Nonetheless, these do not form the predominant character of the area surrounding the appeal site which I have identified above, and in which the appeal proposal would be viewed.
10. For these reasons, therefore, I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in this regard, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies SP4, DM10.1 and DM10.7 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan). When read together these policies require development to respect local character including layout, massing, and density, in addition to being sympathetic with its local context.

Living conditions

11. The appeal site adjoins that of No 7, with both properties possessing a similar rear building line at first-floor level. When combined with the generous separation between the properties at first-floor level, the visual dominance of the appeal property is limited when viewed from the rear garden of No 7. As such the existing relationship between the dwellings affords the occupiers of No 7 an open outlook from the rear garden area.
12. The rear of the proposal would extend close to the shared boundary with No 7. The proposal would project at two-storey level notably beyond the existing first-floor rear elevation with a large and prominent blank wall facing this boundary. The close relationship to the boundary of No 7 combined with the scale of the rear projection would cause the proposal to appear dominant and overbearing when

viewed from the rear garden area of No 7, unacceptably harming the outlook of its occupiers.

13. For these reasons, therefore, I conclude that the development would be harmful to the outlook of the occupiers of No 7. Consequently, in this regard, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies SP4 and DM10.6 of the Local Plan. When read together, these policies require new development to enhance well-being and protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Other Matters

14. No objections from interested parties were received with one in support, and the proposal is not located within a conservation area. Nonetheless, these do not justify the above identified harm to the character and appearance of the area and neighbouring occupiers.
15. The appellant has raised concerns regarding the time it took the Council to validate and determine the original application. However, this is a procedural matter and not something I can consider as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR