
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3157956

8 High Beech, South Croydon, Croydon CR2 7QB

- 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 Ayke Rattansey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/02310/P, dated 2 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single / two storey front / side / rear extensions including raised patio area; erection of dormer extensions in front, side and rear roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single / two storey front / side / rear extensions including raised patio area; erection of dormer extensions in front, side and rear roof slopes at 8 High Beech, South Croydon, Croydon CR2 7QB in accordance with the application Ref 16/02310/P, dated 2 May 2016 and 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: 69/01; 69/02; 69/03; 69/04; 1655/03; 1655/04; 1655/05; 1655/06.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Point

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice, as agreed by the appellant on the appeal form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the area and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 and No 10 High Beech with particular regard to privacy.
-

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. High Beech is a very steeply sloping cul de sac and is characterised by large detached dwellings, in a range of architectural styles, set within spacious and well planted plots. The appeal dwelling and neighbouring properties at Nos 6 and 10 are situated close to the end of the cul de sac, with their front elevations angled around this point, therefore resulting in the absence of a uniform forward building line. In combination, these factors result in a relatively informal building layout.
5. Viewed from the cul de sac to the front, though the side extension would significantly increase the mass of the dwelling, the insertion of dormer windows with roof peaks, would break up the continuity of the roof slope and give a sense of balance and visual interest to the design. Although the side extension would not be set back in relation the front elevation, it would maintain the existing ridgeline of the roof to the side. It would therefore be lower than the maximum height of the dwelling roof and substantially less than the overall height of the building as it drops to meet the significant fall in ground level to the south-west. Furthermore the side extension would be orientated away from the end of the cul de sac which would serve to reduce its prominence.
6. The appearance of the side extension, viewed from the cul de sac, would be in keeping with the existing design of the dwelling, characterised by its steeply sloping roof. The separation and orientation of adjacent dwellings would also ensure that the side extension would not result in any risk of a terracing effect being created. Whilst guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document No 2 - Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD) advocates setting back extensions in order to retain the integrity of the main dwelling and to avoid a terracing effect, it recognises that there may be circumstances where this guidance can be relaxed. I consider, for the above reasons, that the circumstances of this case justify a relaxation of the SPD guidance.
7. The extension to the rear would be bulky and would incorporate an uncharacteristic curved design and squat roof form. However, the appeal plot is sufficiently spacious, secluded and separated from neighbouring dwellings to ensure that the extension would not appear incongruous or dominant from this perspective.
8. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be in accordance with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015; Policies SP1.2, SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013; Saved Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) and the SPD insofar as they seek to promote good design and for development to respect the character of the area.

Living conditions

9. The Council has raised concern that the proposed side facing dormer window in the roof would result in the adjacent property at No 6 being overlooked. There are already side facing windows serving habitable rooms in this elevation. The relationship of the proposed dormer window to the neighbouring plot would

therefore be very similar to that which already exists due the presence of these windows, albeit that it would be higher up.

10. Furthermore, the spacious plot sizes and significant change in ground levels between the two properties, with No 6 being at the markedly lower level, combined with the presence of some intervening screen planting means that the eye would not naturally be drawn towards the side /rear garden area of No 6. I also note that no objection to the proposal appears to have been raised by the occupiers of that property.
11. The orientation and separation of No 10 in relation to the appeal dwelling, would ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of No 10 would not be harmed by the proposed extension.
12. I therefore conclude that the development would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 6 and 10 High Beech with particular regard to privacy. The development would therefore accord with Saved Policies UD2 and UD8 of the UDP and with the SPD insofar as they seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
14. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR