The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2017

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3168626
Greenlands, Buller Road, Thornton Heath CR7 8QX

- 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 Ameen Raza against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 16/02244/P, dated 14 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2016.
- The development proposed is double storey side and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double storey side and single storey rear extension at Greenlands, Buller Road, Thornton Heath CR7 8QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02244/P, dated 14 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:

   i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: GRE/SDC/01PL, GRE/SDC/02PL, and 1:1250 scale site location plan.

   iii) 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 Council, in its decision notice, refers to its Supplementary Planning Document No 2: Residential Extensions and Alterations (the SPD). I have applied some weight to that document due to its role in supporting the relevant development plan policies.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property forms one half of a pair of hipped roofed semi-detached dwellings at the end of, and at an angle to, a row of terraced properties. The

streetscene generally, in the vicinity of the site, is characterised by a predominance of terraced properties of varying designs, mostly with gable ends.

5. I note that there is an extant certificate of lawful development for the erection of a gable end roof extension and rear dormer to Greenlands. However, that remains to be implemented.

6. The proposed development would involve the addition of a gable ended side extension which would not reflect the existing hipped roof symmetry of the semi-pair. However, I have had regard to the circumstance whereby that pair of dwellings is not characteristic of the type and design of dwellings in the streetscene generally. It would also be seen in the context of prominent gable features on neighbouring buildings, including that at the end of the terrace to the south and those relating to two storey outriggers to the rear of properties backing onto the site. In that context, the gable element would not stand out as an incongruous feature of the streetscene.

7. The width of the side extension would not be disproportionate to the existing dwelling's frontage. Together with its degree of set back from the main front elevation at first floor level and the set down of its ridgeline, it would therefore be appropriately subordinate to the existing dwelling and semi-pair as a whole.

8. The single storey rear extension would taper inwards to follow the angle of the rear site boundary which would therefore not reflect the otherwise more regular shape of the rest of the dwelling. However, that aspect of the scheme would be set well back from the street. This, together with its fairly modest height, would prevent it from being a prominent or jarring feature within the streetscene.

9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it would accord with saved policy UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011 and the SPD which together, in respect of this issue, require development to respect the height and proportions of surrounding buildings which play an important role in determining the character of the street, to provide a high quality design response, and to be of the highest architectural quality.

Other matters

10. Concerns have been raised by neighbouring residents about the need to maintain family housing and not allow more Houses in Multiple Occupation, and in respect of the upkeep of the property. However, the proposal is solely for an extension and not for any change of use. I have also received no substantive evidence to indicate that the proposal would be likely to materially exacerbate any existing parking or traffic flow problems in the area and any associated noise and pollution, or cause sewers and drains to become overloaded, especially as it would relate only to one additional bedroom.

11. I have had regard to the close proximity of the proposed development to the rear boundaries of neighbouring properties in Woodville Road, in respect of any potential overshadowing effect. However, at first floor level the side and rear elevations would angle away from the rear boundary. As such it would be

unlikely to reduce the existing levels of sunlight and daylight to and outlook from the properties concerned to an unacceptable extent.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested three conditions that it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these in the light of advice in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance. The standard time condition would be necessary and, in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would also be required. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area, a condition to ensure that the proposed materials relating to external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building would also be necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR