

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3178508
106 Pampisford Road, Purley, CR8 2NF

- 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 Narayan Tyarajan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 17/00373/HSE, dated 23 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of existing single detached garage, construction of 2 storey side extension, converting roof void to habitable accommodation.
-

Preliminary matter

1. The description for the proposed development given on the application form does not refer to the proposed front and rear roof additions. Accordingly, in the interests of precision I propose to use the description set out in the decision below.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing single detached garage, construction of 2 storey side extension, conversion of roof space and associated front and rear roof extensions at 106 Pampisford Road, Purley, CR8 2NF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00373/HSE, dated 23 January 2017, 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: DRWG 02, DRWG 03 and the site location plan submitted with the planning application.
 - 3) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority the external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

Reasons

4. Pampisford Road is characterised by a diverse range of detached family dwellings occupying generous sized plots on land which falls down steeply to the southeast. As a consequence the dwellings on the western side of the road occupy an elevated position, whilst the dwellings on the eastern side of the road sit below street level.
5. The Appeal dwelling sits below the street level and comprises a detached dwelling with a fully hipped roof and asymmetrical fenestration on the front elevation and a symmetrical rear elevation. The dwellings on either side and in close proximity to the Appeal site are more articulated. They include a variety of front/side dormers, projecting gables and bay windows. To the rear the adjacent dwelling at 108 Pampisford Road (No.108) has a large central gable feature on the rear roof slope.
6. Collectively policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Plan: Strategic Policies (Strategic Policies), policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP), policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seek to ensure that new development is visually attractive. It should complement nearby buildings, reinforce and respect the existing character and appearance of an area and contribute to its overall quality, whilst optimising the potential of the site.
7. The Councils Supplementary Planning Document No.2 – *Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD) advises that extensions should be subservient to the existing dwelling and have regard to the form and layout of adjacent dwellings. Extensions should not appear incongruous. It advises that roof extensions are not normally allowed on front roof slopes and that they should not dominate the original building. Roof additions should not normally be more than two thirds the width of the building and dormer windows should ideally be located above and reflect the size and proportions of the window below.
8. The proposed side extension has been designed as a continuation of the existing dwelling and would be largely undistinguishable from the host dwelling. In addition, the resultant gap between the side extension and the dwelling at 104 Pampisford Road (No.104) would respect the overall spatial characteristics of the road.
9. The proposed front dormer window would be modest in scale and form and would align with and respect the size and proportions of the window below. At the same time it would help break up the unrelieved horizontal lines of the proposed roof. To the rear the proposed roof gable extension would retain and reinforce the symmetrical appearance of the rear of the dwelling. It would not exceed two thirds of the width of the resultant dwelling and would sit comfortably alongside the central rear gable roof at No.108.

10. For these reasons the proposed extension would respect and blend in appropriately with the host building. It would complement nearby buildings, reinforce and respect the diverse character of the area
11. The Council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching external materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. Both of these conditions are necessary to ensure that the proposed extension blends in appropriately with the host dwelling and in the interests of certainty.
12. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. It would therefore comply with policy SP4.1 of the Strategic Policies, policies UD2 and UD3 of the UDP, policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, the NPPF and the objectives of the SPD.

Other matters

13. With the proposal the side extension would project closer to the dwelling at No.104. However, and notwithstanding the changes in ground levels, the spatial relationship between the extended dwelling and the dwelling at No.104 would be typical of the locality.
14. The proposed rear first floor window in the side extension would serve a bathroom and the proposed second floor bedroom window would be located more than five metres from the boundaries with the adjacent dwellings. The front facing roof lights would look out towards the street scene and the rear facing roof light would serve a bathroom. Due to the elevated position of the dwellings along this stretch of Pampisford Road the rear facing windows, even at ground floor level, look out over the rear garden environment.
15. Accordingly the scheme would not result in a material loss of privacy for the occupiers of the adjacent and nearby dwellings.
16. The rear gardens of the dwellings along this part of Pampisford Road drop away steeply to the southeast and this increases the perceived size of the rear elevations of the dwellings within the rear garden environment. However, this is a characteristic of the area and the resultant dwelling would be no taller than the existing dwelling and the rear facing gable would be hipped away from the side boundaries of the site. As a consequence the resultant dwelling would blend in with the character and appearance of the rear garden environment and would not be visually overbearing for the occupiers of the adjacent and nearby dwellings.
17. Finally, whilst it is accepted that the extension would increase the size of the dwelling, its occupation as a single dwelling should not result in a material level of noise and disturbance for the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. It should be noted that excessive noise generated by the occupiers of a building is something that can be addressed under other legislation.

Conclusion

18. Having regard to the conclusion on the main issue and the other matters raised the Appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR