



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/24/3355414

58 Wharncliffe Gardens, South Norwood, London SE25 6DQ

- 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 Stephen Ayles against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/02331/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: Erection of additional storey, front and rear dormers, and single storey rear extension to facilitate the conversion of an existing detached dwelling house into two semi-detached dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The second reason for refusal within the decision notice references the effect of the proposal on 28 Wharncliffe Gardens and 30 Wharncliffe Gardens. It was clear from the submitted documents and my site visit that the second reason for refusal relates to the effect of the proposal on 28 Wharncliffe Road and 30 Wharncliffe Road. I have therefore proceeded on this basis.
3. The appellant has submitted amended plans as part of the appeal which include the addition of single-storey lean-to porches and alterations to window sizes and detailing within the front elevation. These amendments do not form a fundamental change to the appeal scheme. Further, the Council were aware of these amended plans prior to the submission of their statement and accepting them would not result in any procedural unfairness. I have therefore continued on this basis.

Main Issues:

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of 28 Wharncliffe Road and 30 Wharncliffe Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property forms a detached bungalow at the end of Wharncliffe Gardens. This section of Wharncliffe Gardens is primarily characterised by two-storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings. Whilst many of the roofs have been

altered, they predominantly comprise pitched and hipped roofs. These properties share a similar architecture, with features such as two-storey bays articulating the front elevations and giving the built environment a visual continuity.

6. The single-storey form of the appeal property does not reflect the character of the surrounding dwellings. Nevertheless, its low profile minimises its presence within the street scene and contributes to the openness.
7. The proposed two-storey semi-detached dwellings would utilise a barn-hip roof, appearing incongruous and out of character with the surrounding pitched and hipped roof forms. Whilst I note the amended plans include features such as single-storey lean-to porches and window detailing, they would lack the more prominent architectural features of the surrounding dwellings such as two-storey bay windows. This would limit the articulation of the front elevation, emphasising its visual bulk and preventing any connection to the surrounding built character. The two-storey nature of the proposal would additionally be far more visually prominent and erode the existing openness of the street scene facilitated by the low profile of the appeal property.
8. For these reasons, therefore, 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 Policy D3 of The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) (London Plan), and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan). When read together, these policies require new development to enhance local context and respect local character.

Living conditions

9. The appeal property adjoins the rear boundaries of dwellings fronting Wharncliffe Road. 28 Wharncliffe Road (No 28) and 30 Wharncliffe Road (No 30) are at a lower ground level than the appeal site with the side elevation of the appeal property positioned close to the shared boundary. Despite the appeal sites higher elevation, the low profile of the appeal property limits its effect on the outlook of the occupiers of No's 28 and 30 from their rear windows and garden areas.
10. The proposal would result in a notable increase in height and bulk in comparison to the existing dwelling, with the use of a barn-hip roof further emphasizing the massing of the side elevation. When combined with the higher level of the appeal site, it would create a substantial form of development close to the rear boundaries of No's 28 and 30. The proposal would therefore appear oppressive and overbearing when viewed from the rear windows and garden areas of No's 28 and 30. I note there is some disagreement between parties regarding the distance between the rear elevations of No's 28 and 30 and the proposal. Even if the appellant's distance of 12.4 metres is correct, given the scale of the proposal and its higher ground level, it would have an unacceptable impact on the outlook of the occupiers of No's 28 and 30.
11. For these reasons, therefore, the development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No's 28 and 30 with particular regard to outlook. Consequently, in this regard, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D3 of the London Plan and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Local Plan. When read together, these policies require new development to deliver appropriate outlook and protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

12. Policy D6 of the London Plan primarily relates to internal and external space standards in addition to the provision of levels of daylight and sunlight. As such, I find no conflict with this policy which weighs neither for nor against the proposal.

Other Matters

13. The appellant refers to the development of Christina Court, nevertheless I do not know the circumstances which resulted in the construction of this development. Furthermore, Christina Court is approximately 200 metres from the appeal site and does not therefore form part of the context within which the proposal would be viewed.
14. The proposal would contribute an additional dwelling to the housing stock in addition to both properties being sustainable, energy efficient, and utilising air source heat pumps. Nevertheless, given the scale of the proposal these combined benefits are limited and would not justify the above identified harm.

Conclusion

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

N Unwin

INSPECTOR