



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: 30th of May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3356527

15 Mitchley Avenue, Croydon, Purley CR8 1BZ

- 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 Ms Linda Kugler (Ace Builders) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application ref is 24/01105/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as: 1st floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 1st floor extension at 15 Mitchley Avenue, Croydon, Purley CR8 1BZ in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 24/01105/HSE, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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 PP-12923334v1; GD-00-ZZ-DR-A- 073; GD-00-ZZ-DR-A- 074; GD-00-ZZ-DR-A- 075; GD-00-ZZ-DR-A- 076; GD-00-ZZ-DR-A- 077; and GD-00-ZZ-DR-A- 078;
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detach two-storey dwelling on the corner of Mitchley Avenue and Coombe Wood Hill. The area is primarily residential with properties varied in their design with many of these having been altered and extended. Nevertheless, two-storey gables with two-storey bay windows are a consistent feature forming a distinctive part of the character and appearance of the area.
4. The appeal property contributes to the area's varied architecture with the two-storey front gable and bay providing the visual link to the surrounding dwellings. A single-storey flat roofed bay forming part of the front elevation adjoins the existing two-storey bay appearing subservient and adding to the varied architecture of the area.

5. The proposal would extend above the existing single-storey bay to create a second at first-floor level. The proposal would mirror the design and materials of the adjoining front bay at first-floor level, adding a symmetry to the front elevation. Further, it would reflect the prevailing two-storey bay design feature, allowing it to assimilate with the surrounding built environment. Whilst two, two-storey bays are unusual for the area, this would add to the existing varied character and represent a continuation of the ground-floor bay feature. The proposal would not extend beyond the existing side elevation of the appeal property, maintaining its existing width and proportions. Whilst not set back from the existing front elevation, the use of a flat roof would limit the height of the proposal and appear subservient to the host dwelling preventing a dominant appearance. Further, the front and side slope above the eaves would be clad in tiles to match that of the existing dwelling, disguising the flat roof and facilitating its integration with the roof of the host property and appear reflective of its existing character.
6. For these reasons, therefore, I conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D3 of the The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018). When read together these policies require new development to respect and enhance Croydon's varied local character and positively respond to local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

7. Interested party comments suggest the proposal would be used as a separate planning unit that would provide inadequate living space for future occupiers. Nonetheless, the proposal is for a first-floor extension to an existing dwelling and would not create a separate planning unit.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition relating to materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the building and the area.
9. The Council has requested a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement. There is nothing to indicate that the appeal development would not be safe from fire and therefore, in the specific circumstances of this case, such a condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR