

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2017

by M C J Nunn BA BPL LLB LLM BCL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3167604

11 Peacock Gardens, South Croydon, CR2 8TE

- 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 Anthony Wright against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref: 16/04228/HSE, dated 13 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2016.
 - The development is described as "two storey side extension, single storey rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 11 Peacock Gardens, South Croydon, CR2 8TE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/04228/HSE, dated 13 August 2016, 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: Floor Plans: 033/PJ/2015/01 Rev A, Elevations: 033/PJ/2015/02 Rev A, Location Plan.
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be inserted in the south east flank elevation of the extension hereby permitted.

Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and host dwelling. Set on steeply rising ground, the appeal property, dating from the 1960s or 1970s, is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling, with an irregular gable design. The dwellings in the locality date from the same era and are of varying styles, although a number are similar to the appeal dwelling. Some properties in the area have been altered or extended.
-

3. This scheme proposes creating an additional storey over the flat roofed garage at the side. Because of the proposed 'catslide' roof and small front dormer window, a 'box-like' and bulky appearance would be avoided. The overall ridge height of the hipped roof would be set well below that of the main dwelling, and the sloping first floor element would be recessed from the main facade. These features would achieve an appropriate degree of subservience to the existing house, and reduce the extension's impact when viewed from the street.
4. The staggered position of the properties means that there would be no terracing effect. Although the gap between the dwellings at first floor level would be reduced, the spacious character of the area would be preserved. The single storey addition to the rear would be unobtrusive, and have no effect on the street scene. Provided appropriate materials are used, the scheme would be satisfactorily assimilated within the locality. The Council has referred to other refused applications and dismissed appeals. I have not been provided with the details of those cases, and therefore have little knowledge of them, and I cannot be certain they are comparable. In any event, my decision is based on the merits of the case before me and on its site specific circumstances.
5. To sum up, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area, or host dwelling. No conflict would arise with Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan requiring proposals to reinforce and respect the existing development pattern. The proposal would accord with Policy SP4 of the Local Plan: Strategic Policies which requires high quality development that respects and enhances Croydon's varied local character. It would accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which require development to have regard to local context, as well as complying with the overarching aims of the Supplementary Planning Document No 2 on Residential Extensions and Alterations.
6. A commencement condition is necessary to comply with the relevant legislation. A condition requiring compliance with the approved plans is necessary for certainty. A condition requiring materials to match those in the existing dwelling is required to safeguard the character of the building, as well as the wider area. A condition precluding the insertion of windows in the flank elevation is necessary to protect the privacy at the neighbouring property. Subject to these conditions, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Matthew C J Nunn

INSPECTOR