
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February, 2017

by S. J. Buckingham, BA (Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI FSA

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

Decision date: 17th March, 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3162895

87 Addiscombe Road, Croydon, CR0 6SF

- 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 Dadoo Partnership Ltd. against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application ref: 16/02794/P dated 27 May, 2016 was refused by notice dated 5 August, 2016.
 - The development proposed is 2-storey rear extension with 2m away from side boundary line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and permission is granted for a 2-storey rear extension with 2m away from side boundary line at 87 Addiscombe Road, Croydon, CR0 6SF in accordance with application ref: 16/02794/P dated 27 May, 2016 and the drawings submitted with it, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 14032 PE 01.01 and 14032 PE 01.02.
 - 3) All new external work and work of making good shall be carried out in materials to match the existing.
 - 4) No windows shall be provided in the eastern or western elevations of the extension hereby approved.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above and in my decision has been taken from the application form. On the Council's decision notice a different description was used, however, as the difference between the two is not significant, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in respect of outlook.
-

Reasons

4. No. 87 Addiscombe Road is a residential end of terrace building of two-storeys plus a roof storey to the front and lower ground floor to the rear. The appeal proposal is for a two-storey rear extension.
5. There is some dispute between the Council and the appellant as to the height of the proposed extension. The land slopes down from the front of the appeal site to the rear, and as a result the extension would start at the lower ground level of the plot. While of two storeys, therefore, it would be partially sunk, and would come up to a height equivalent to that of the ground floor of the host dwelling and those of adjacent dwellings. It would have a flat roof, and would span around two thirds of the width of the rear elevation, around half the width of the plot, and would be set away from the side boundaries by several metres on either side. It would therefore be relatively modest in dimensions.
6. The extension, while it would extend some metres beyond the rear building lines of Nos. 85 and 89, would extend only a relatively small distance beyond the existing rear extension of the host building, to which it would be attached. No. 85 sits around a metre away from the boundary with No. 87, and has a narrow single storey rear extension on the flank adjacent to that boundary. It appears to me therefore that this projection would shield the appeal extension from view from rear ground floor windows of that dwelling. The existing two-storey rear extension of No. 87 projects several metres beyond the rear elevation of No. 89, and would thereby largely shield the appeal extension from view from rear windows on that property.
7. Upper floor windows in Nos. 85 and 89 already take in a relatively dense, urban townscape of modest rear gardens, rear extensions and outhouses. The appeal extension, due to its size and siting, would appear at the periphery of oblique views, and at a lower level, and would not therefore be significantly intrusive in this context. I conclude therefore that the proposed rear extension, due to its siting and relatively modest size, would not harm the outlook of occupiers of adjoining dwellings.
8. I have had regard to the appeal decisions put before me, which relate to other parts of the country. Insufficient detail has been supplied for me to be sure that the circumstances of the cases given are directly comparable to this one, however I have, on the basis of other evidence, concluded that the appeal should be allowed.
9. I conclude therefore that, as there would be only limited sight of the proposed extension from Nos. 85 and 89, and as it would be of modest dimensions, it would not form a harmful element in the outlook of occupiers of these dwellings. It would not therefore conflict with the provisions of Policy 7.6 of the London Plan, saved Policy UD8 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006, and Supplementary Planning Document 2 in respect of protecting the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

10. As the windows on the proposed extension face rearwards and not towards the garden of No. 85, and although the occupiers of that dwelling have expressed concern, there would therefore be no significant effect on their privacy.

11. While concerns were expressed by the third party over the accuracy of the submitted plans, I have seen nothing in the plans or on site to verify this concern.
12. Comment from a neighbouring occupier has mentioned an outstanding enforcement action relating to the existing extension on No. 87, but nothing has been put before me in relation to such a matter.
13. Any disruption caused by construction works would be only temporary in nature.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to the conditions put forward by the Council and to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. For clarity, a condition is added requiring implementation of the development in accordance with the approved plans. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area, I have attached a condition requiring that materials to be used match existing work. A condition is also added preventing the installation of windows in the side elevations of the extension, in the interests of protecting the privacy of occupiers of adjacent dwellings.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, therefore, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S J Buckingham

INSPECTOR