
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Gwyn Clark BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/17/3171746

11 Selwood Road, Croydon CR0 7JU

- 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 Mrs Sheena Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/06299/FUL, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of 3m rear single storey extension and 1.9m first floor extension to facilitate the conversion of the existing property into 3 self-contained flats. Provision of new bicycle and bin store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed extension upon (i) the character and appearance of the area (ii) the living conditions of neighbours with regard to an overbearing effect and outlook, and (iii) the quality of the living conditions provided.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 11 Selwood Road is a 2 storey dwelling that stands at the end of a terraced row of similarly designed houses. It is attached to No 9 and separated from its other neighbour No 13 by a footpath that leads to the rear of the property and by the neighbour's single storey garage. The appeal property has been recently extended by the addition of a large flat roofed dormer to the rear. While very apparent when viewed from the rear it is not readily visible when viewed from Selwood Road.
4. The rear of this row of houses is attractively designed. A particularly attractive original feature is that each pair of houses has been provided with an extension shared by its neighbour under a hipped and tiled roof. In addition the houses at each end of the row (including the appeal property) have been provided with a projecting bay window at first floor. The two houses at each end of this row also now have similar flat roofed dormer extensions. There has been some infilling of the gap between the original outbuildings with single story glazed

- extensions, and on the neighbouring house, No 9, a lightweight rear porch has been added. The gardens are divided by close boarded timber fencing.
5. The proposed extension would facilitate the conversion of the house into three flats. It has been designed in a sympathetic way to the original house and would be constructed in matching brickwork and tiled roof. The cantilevered window at first floor would be retained. It would sit against the brick gable of the extension, projecting forward from its current position on the building by around 1.916m. The ground floor extension would lie on the boundary and extend no further than 3m from the original house.
 6. While the details of the design of the extension would be reasonably sympathetic to the original dwelling in terms of its appearance I also take into account the context which includes the recent dormer extension to the roof. The cumulative effect of all extensions at ground, first and second floor would be disproportionate and excessive in scale, overwhelming the original dwelling and proving to be out of character with it and houses in the immediate locality. Although situated on the rear and so not particularly apparent from Selwood Road the extensions would be clearly visible to several neighbours at the rear.
 7. I therefore consider the extension proposed would have a significant harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area and as a consequence would prove contrary to policy 7.4 of the London Plan, policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies and policies UD2, UD3 and UD8 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, as collectively, these policies seek new development that is of a high standard of design, respectful of the character of the area and with regard to the form and layout of existing and adjacent buildings.

Effect upon the living conditions of neighbours

8. I consider that there would be no significant adverse effect upon neighbours in terms of an overbearing effect, overshadowing or loss of light. This is because from the perspective of No 13 there is ample separation distance between the two properties, and for No 9, the single storey extension along its boundary would only project around 1.6m beyond their rear porch. I note concerns have been expressed over potential noise but I do not have sufficient evidence before me that would lead me to consider this would occur to any harmful extent.

Quality of the living conditions

9. The appellant has pointed out that with the inclusion of a vestibule area at first floor, the second floor studio flat would have a floor area that exceeds the minimum required by relevant policy. I have no contrary statement from the local planning authority in this regard. Adequate outdoor space to serve all three flats would be provided in the rear garden and I consider that the location of this is in relation to all three flats is quite reasonable. Consequently I consider that the requirements of policies of the London Plan and policy SP2.6 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies, designed to achieve an appropriate minimum standard of accommodation, are met.

Conclusion

10. The extension proposed would facilitate the creation of three self-contained flats. Although small in number this would nevertheless make a valuable

contribution toward meeting the need for such accommodation and in so doing provide a social benefit. I afford this significant weight. However I consider that the extension proposed would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and to the local area due to its excessive scale. This harm would outweigh the benefit I have identified and accordingly I dismiss the appeal.

Gwyn Clark

INSPECTOR