

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: Friday 3 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3164029

110 Waddon Road, Croydon, CR0 4JJ

- 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 C D'Souza against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/02956/P, dated 18 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 110 Waddon Road, Croydon, CR0 4JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02956/P, dated 18 May 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling standing on a corner plot at the junction of Waddon Road and Rigby Close. Waddon Road is a busy road, connecting with the A23 less than 100m to the west of the site. Rigby Close is a quiet cul-de-sac comprised of short terraces of dwellings on each frontage and a three-storey block of flats at the end.
 4. The proposed extension would be built to the side of the house with its footprint filling the space between the dwelling's side elevation and the back of the pavement leading into Rigby Close. This space is currently occupied by some sheds/outbuildings, but in view of their low height they are not particularly prominent.
 5. The Council relies heavily on guidance provided in its Supplementary Planning Document No 2 on Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD). This provides detailed and generally helpful design advice on two storey side extensions and development affecting corner plots, such as the appeal site.
 6. The SPD warns against the prospect of two-storey side extensions giving rise to a terracing effect, but since the appeal site is a corner plot, a substantial gap would exist between the appeal property, if extended, and No 26 Rigby Close
-

to the east. Moreover, No 26 is built on a different axis to the appeal dwelling, with its front elevation facing the appeal property's side elevation.

7. Whilst the front elevation of the ground floor element of the proposed extension would be on the same plane as the existing front elevation, the upper floor would be distinctly set back by about 1.5m. A hipped roof would be employed and the extension's ridge would be noticeably lower than that of the existing dwelling. The extension's appearance has been designed to match that of the host property.
8. Taking all these factors into account I am content that no terracing effect would ensue, that the extension would be perceived as being appropriately subordinate in scale and mass to the host property and that its design aptly reflects the appearance of the appeal property.
9. The SPD is not wholly inimical to development on corner plots, but advises as to some possible pitfalls. The extension would project forward of the building line of the terrace on the western frontage of Rigby Close. However, given the extent of the separation between the proposed development and the nearest dwelling in Rigby Close, on the same side of the street, coupled with the use of a hip, which would give the impression of space at roof level, I do not consider that the proposal, although prominent, could be properly perceived as overly or harmfully dominant in the street scene.
10. I conclude that the proposal would be of an acceptable subordinate scale and design having no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area. Accordingly, no material conflict arises with those provisions of saved policies UD2 & UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan that, in combination, require development to reinforce and respect the existing development pattern and that of surrounding buildings.

Conditions

11. The Council's suggested condition on materials shall be imposed in the interests of local visual amenity.
12. It is also necessary, in the interests of certainty that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Other matters

13. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, including the references to the *National Planning Policy Framework*, but no matter raised is of such significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. PL01 to PL09 (inclusive).