
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/17/3167680

278-280 Lower Addiscombe Road, Croydon CR0 7AE

- 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 Mehmet Keso against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/04689/FUL, dated 9 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations at 278-280 Lower Addiscombe Road, Croydon CR0 7AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04689/FUL, dated 9 September 2016, 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: Drawing 01 - Location Plan dated 08.09.2016; Drawing 02 Revision A - Site Location Plan and Existing Plans, Elevations and Section dated 28.10.2016; and Drawing 03 Revision A - Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Section dated 28.10.2016.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was amended prior to its determination by the Council, with revisions to drawings 02 and 03 dated 28 October 2016 (revision A) being made. Those drawings are listed on the Council's decision notice and therefore form part of the decision made by the Council. In connection with the appeal revised versions (revision B) for drawings 01 and 03 have been submitted. As the revision B drawings did not form part of the Council's consideration of the application I have not taken account of them in reaching my decision.
-

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on: the character and appearance of the streetscene; and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The development would involve the construction of a single storey, flat roofed extension within a yard to the rear of 278 to 284 Lower Addiscombe Road (Nos 278 to 284). Nos 278 to 284 being in a terrace of properties that comprise commercial units on the ground floor with residential accommodation above. Lower Addiscombe Road is a local shopping area.
5. The extension would form part of the shop premises at Nos 278 and 280 and because this addition would wrap around the rear of Nos 282 to 284 its eastern elevation would front directly onto Fernhurst Road, a residential street. Although the extension would be a comparatively large addition, it is only the eastern elevation that would be visible within Fernhurst Road's streetscene. The eastern elevation would be 3.65 metre high¹.
6. The extension's eastern elevation would be considerably taller than the existing boundary wall and gates fronting Fernhurst Road. However, I consider that this addition would not look out of place within the streetscene at this point, which I found to relate more to the local shopping area than the residential properties in Fernhurst Road. Of particular note is the substantial single storey, flat roofed rearward projection at 286 Lower Addiscombe Road, premises opposite the appeal site. I consider that the extension's effect on the streetscene would be similar to that of No 286's rearward projection.
7. I therefore conclude that the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The development would therefore accord with Policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies of 2013 (the CLPSP); saved Policy UD2 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan of 2006 (the UDP); and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (with consolidated alterations since 2011) of 2015 (the London Plan). That is because the new building would be of a design that would respect the streetscene.

Highway Safety

8. The development would mean that Nos 278 and 280 would no longer have any off-street parking available to it. The existing retail premises have a floor area of around 300 square metres and the extension would have an area of around 93 square metres. However, the proposed floor plan suggests that the additional floorspace would be used for purposes ancillary to the retail use. While the development would leave Nos 278 and 280 with no on-site parking, it would be comparable with many of the other commercial premises in the local shopping area. I consider that an additional property without on-site parking in this shopping area would be unlikely to generate any significant additional: parking demand; or customer, staff or delivery vehicle movements. On that basis I consider that the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users would not be adversely affected.

¹ Dimension taken from the Council's officer report

9. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that the development would not be harmful to highway safety in the area and that there would therefore be no conflict with Policy SP8.18 of the CLPSP, Policies T2 and T8 of the UDP and Policy 6.3 of the London Plan. I consider that Policies UD12 and UD13 are not relevant because they concern the design for new street and parking layouts.

Other Matter

10. Comments have been made that the premises are to be used as a supermarket rather than as a plumbers merchants. Both of those uses are of a retail nature and the switch between them does not require planning permission and is therefore not for consideration as part of this appeal. Similarly the opening hours for the premises are not for consideration because a change of use requiring planning permission is not being sought.

Conditions

11. The Council has provided no suggested conditions. Apart from the standard time condition I find it necessary to impose a condition requiring the development to be built to accord with the application plans for reasons of certainty. To safeguard the appearance of the area it is necessary that the extension is constructed with materials to match those of the existing building, as stated on the application form, and I have therefore imposed a condition to that effect.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR