

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2016

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31st October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/16/3154899

103 Lower Addiscombe Road, Croydon CR0 6PU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Charlie McDermot against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 15/03920/P, dated 2 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2016.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "Proposed conversion of shop unit into 3no self contained units with new extension to rear and roof/loft conversion."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations, erection of rear extension at first and second floors and dormer extension in rear roof slope at 103 Lower Addiscombe Road, Croydon CR0 6PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/03920/P, dated 2 September 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. E/P1 and P/C1mk5.
 - 3) Notwithstanding Condition 2, the dormer extension hereby approved shall be restricted in size to that shown on the Proposed Rear Elevation of Drawing No. P/C1mk5.
 - 4) Notwithstanding Condition 2, prior to the commencement of any superstructure works on site, details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out and retained thereafter in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Charlie McDermot against the Council of the London Borough of Croydon. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.
-

Procedural Matters

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, I note from the chronology of the evidence before me that the scheme was revised and amended plans (Drawing No. P/C1mk5) were submitted to the Council prior to the determination of the planning application.
4. These amended plans show the alteration and extension of the 2 existing flats located on the upper floors of the appeal property, rather than the conversion into 3 self-contained units originally proposed.
5. The Council's decision notice describes the proposed development as "Alterations; erection of rear extension at first and second floors and dormer extension in rear roof slope".
6. The appellant has confirmed that it is the scheme as shown on this last amended plan and as described by the Council on the decision notice which forms the basis of the appeal. The Council has recently advised that the decision was based on an earlier version of the proposed plans, which show the conversion of the appeal property into 3 units.
7. Nevertheless, I note that the Council's concerns, as set out in the reason for refusal, relate to the external appearance of the proposed development. Although the scheme was revised during the course of the application, the external appearance of the proposed development did not fundamentally change.
8. Against the background set out above I have based my decision upon the scheme as shown on Drawing No. P/C1mk5 and the revised description of development set out on the Council's decision notice, as neither of the parties would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me taking this course of action.
9. I have also noticed that Drawing No. P/C1mk5 does not indicate the proposed dormer extension on the proposed third floor plan. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the dimensions of the dormer extension shown on the proposed rear elevation, and have addressed this matter by condition.

Main Issue

10. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

11. The appeal property is a 3 storey building in mixed retail and residential use located in a terrace on the north side of Lower Addiscombe Road. The rear of the terrace is visible from Hastings Road to the west, and I noted during my site visit that it features a variety of rear extensions and dormer windows. The terrace immediately to the west of Hastings Road also has a range of rear extensions and dormers.
12. The proposed rear extension at first and second floor level would infill the space that currently exists between the rear projections of 101 and 105 Lower Addiscombe Road and, in that context, would reflect the scale and pattern of

the established built form immediately adjacent to the appeal site. I note that the Council raises no objection to this element of the appeal proposal.

13. As shown on the proposed rear elevation on Drawing No. P/C1mk5, the dormer extension would be set in substantially from both the east and west boundary of the appeal property. Consequently, it would not dominate the existing roof slope or the building as a whole. The scale of the proposed dormer extension would echo that of existing roof extensions in the immediate vicinity, and views of the dormer would be restricted by the siting and projection of the proposed rear extension at first and second floor level.
14. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The appeal proposal would therefore accord with the sustainable development and design aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan, Policies SP1.1, SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies and Supplementary Planning Document No 2: Residential Extensions and Alterations.

Other matters

15. Although not referred to in the Council's delegated report or reason for refusal, the Council's appeal statement makes reference at paragraphs 7.4 – 7.6 to minimum internal space standards set out in the nationally described space standard and the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.
16. As the revised scheme shown on Drawing No. P/C1mk5 and described on the Council's decision notice does not relate to the creation of additional residential units within the appeal property, I have afforded this matter little weight.

Conditions

17. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to ensure the suitable appearance of the development and safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition relating to the size of the dormer extension and the materials to be used.
18. The Council's delegated report indicates that, to avoid overlooking, a condition could be imposed requiring the provision of privacy screens around the terrace that would be formed above the flat roof of the proposed rear extension. However, due to the siting of the proposed roof terrace in relation to existing development, the potential for overlooking would be limited. Therefore, I do not consider that such a condition would be necessary.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR