The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2016

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/16/3156240
1 Apsley Road, South Norwood, London SE25

- 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 David Farningham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 16/01495/P, dated 19 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
- The development proposed is conversion of ground & first floor to 2No. one bedroom self contained flats including two storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of ground & first floor to 2No. one bedroom self contained flats including two storey rear extension at 1 Apsley Road, South Norwood, London SE25 in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01495/P, dated 19 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:

   i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   ii) No development shall take place until details of refuse and cycle storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. That storage shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby permitted and thereafter maintained as such.

   iii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, 9257_2A and 9257_3A.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council, in its decision notice, refers to its Supplementary Planning Document 2: Residential Extensions and Alterations (the SPD). I have afforded some weight to that document due to its role in supporting the relevant development plan policies.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The site comprises a three storey, including basement, end of terrace dwelling. That terrace is short, comprising just four dwellings, and separated from the rest of the dwellings on that side of the street by a playground. The terrace has a fairly uniform appearance but is seen in the context of various building designs in the immediate vicinity. The rear outriggers are also of a fairly uniform nature but that uniformity is not clearly apparent from the street.

5. The proposed extension would project beyond the existing outrigger of No 1, adding some additional bulk to the building and breaking the existing uniformity of the terrace at the rear. However, it would continue the same height and roof slope of the existing outrigger, including its parapet wall along the top of its mono-pitch roof. As such, its design would not be significantly at odds with that element of the existing building, albeit that the eaves would be lower and it would be slightly wider. Furthermore, due to its relatively modest depth compared to the existing building, it would not add such bulk as to be a dominant addition.

6. The proposal would be visible from Apsley Road but only to a restricted extent from very close to the site, due to the fairly close proximity of the adjacent two storey building at Nos 1a and 1c immediately to the south-west. That building would block longer views of the proposal from along the street. Together with its set back well away from the street, the proposal would therefore be fairly discreet in that context and would not be a prominent feature of the street scene. It would also be seen in the context of the variety of building designs in the immediate vicinity.

7. It would be visible in the context of the whole of the back of that short terrace from the rear of some of the surrounding residential properties to the side of, and behind, the site. However, such views would again be in the context of the variety of building designs in the vicinity, particularly to the rear of Portland Road properties and that of the adjacent building at Nos 1a and 1c. It would also be seen as not encroaching significantly on the openness of the rear garden, most of which would remain. Sight of the proposal from a number of Portland Road properties and those to the rear would also be softened to varying degrees by existing intervening trees. The break in the uniformity of the rear of the existing terrace would therefore not stand out as an incongruous or unacceptably jarring feature in that context.

8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it would accord with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, policies SP1.2, SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies, and saved policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan: The Croydon Plan, and would not be at odds with the aims of the SPD, which together require development of a high quality design, which respects and enhances local character.

9. I have had regard to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of No 1c Apsley Road in respect of outlook, sunlight and daylight. However, the only main habitable room windows of No 1c face to the rear. The proposed extension would project only a fairly short distance beyond the rear of No 1c. Together with the degree of separation of the two buildings, the proposal would therefore be unlikely to have an overbearing or enclosing

effect, despite its height and difference in levels between the two sites, or to cause a material loss of daylight. Furthermore, the aspect to the rear would ensure that there would not be a significant reduction in sunlight to that property or to No 3.

10. The Council has suggested two conditions that it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these in the light of advice in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance and amended some of the wording.

11. The standard time condition is required in this case. A condition to secure details of refuse and cycle storage would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and, in respect of cycle storage, to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport to the private car. In addition to those two conditions, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would also be required.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR