

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2016

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3158836

23 Rockmount Road, Upper Norwood, London, SE19 3SZ

- 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 Crowe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/02813/P, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear extensions and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the existing occupiers of nearby dwellings with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The extension would project from the rear wall of the property by about 6m and would also extend into the area to the rear of the dwelling. It would have a flat roof and would be rendered to match the main dwelling. In this regard I appreciate that its relationship to the main dwelling would be acceptable. Nevertheless the resultant relationship with adjacent dwellings must be considered.
 4. The Council's decision refers to the extension being a visual intrusion. The officer's report specifically refers to the impact to No 27 Rockmount Road. I therefore consider the resultant relationship between these properties. No 27 is adjacent to the appeal property. The Council identify that it is split into flats and has windows within the rear elevation and side elevations facing the appeal property. A fence runs along the common boundary with no 23. There is also a level change which places No 23 higher than No 27.
 5. The appeal proposal would be almost twice the depth of the existing extension. A considerable proportion of the extension would appear above the existing fence. This would be in very close proximity to the common boundary with No 27 for a distance of over 6m. As a consequence it would have an overbearing presence which would create an oppressive sense of enclosure. This would be compounded by the level change between the two properties. I appreciate that the existing extension and garage adjacent to No 21 would be removed. The
-

appellant also considers that the scheme would accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2 (SPG). The SPG does allow for 'larger' extensions (over 3m) on well separated detached dwellings. However, whilst detached, No 23 cannot in my view be described as well separated from No 27.

6. I therefore conclude that the extension would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupants of No 27, with particular regard to outlook. It would conflict with policies UD8 of the Croydon Replacement UDP, Supplementary Planning Document No 2 Residential Extensions and Alterations, and policy 7.6 of the London Plan which set out that new development should not have an unacceptable impact on the light, privacy or amenity of adjoining property.

Other matters

7. The site is located within the Harold Road Conservation Area. The current appearance of the site is not harming the character and appearance of the area. The extension would not harm the character appearance of the main dwelling and would be constructed from appropriate materials. Accordingly the proposal would preserve the character of the Conservation Area in which it is located.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of an objection from No 27, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR