



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2019

by Jamie Reed DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/19/3223668
230-234 Portland Road, Norwood, SE25 4SL

- 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 Sterling Rose Developments Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 18/05007/FUL, dated 12 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 'alterations to the façade, extension at second floor level to provide 1 x 2 bedroom flat, including alterations to the front and rear elevation and provision of cycle and refuse storage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to the façade, extension at second floor level to provide 1 x 2 bedroom flat including alterations to the front and rear elevation and provision of cycle and refuse storage at 230 – 234 Portland Road, Norwood SE25 4SL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/05007/FUL, dated 12 October 2018, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Background and Main Issues

2. Prior approval¹ has recently been granted for the appeal property to be converted into 12 self-contained flats and the works to facilitate this development were ongoing at the time of my visit.
3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of occupiers of the appeal property.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a part 2 storey, part 3 storey former office building situated in a predominantly residential area. The 2 storey section of the building is currently of a flat roof construction whereas the 3 storey section has a pitched roof with small, dormer windows. The proposed 2 bedroom flat would be formed by adding a pitched roof to the 2 storey section of the building, which would coalesce the differing elements of the building and improve its overall appearance.

¹ Local Authority Refs 18/04143/GPDO and 17/05809/GPDO

5. A low brick boundary wall interspersed with taller brick columns encloses the frontage of the building. Metal railings infill the sections between the brick columns. Due to the appeal property having no rear access, covered cycle and enclosed refuse storage would be located behind this boundary wall as part of the proposal. These storage areas would be screened by planting, which would be introduced behind the sections of wall where the railings are present. Other examples of enclosed storage located within the frontage of dwellings are evident nearby and as a result the proposal would integrate successfully with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. Whilst about half of the depth of the frontage would be taken up by the storage areas and their screen planting, these would be positioned away from the building, leaving a physical separation between these and the building itself. As a result, I do not find the proposed cycle and refuse storage arrangements to be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property itself.
7. When standing within the frontage area or when looking out from the appeal property's windows, the enclosed refuse and covered cycle storage would only be at a low level, allowing views out over the boundary wall. As a result, the proposal would not be visually harmful to the outlook of future occupiers. Around half of the depth of the frontage area would remain for movement allowing sufficient access to the storage areas and therefore the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of future occupiers.
8. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policies 6.3 and 6.9 of the London Plan (consolidated with alterations) (2016) and Policies SP8, DM10, DM13, DM29 and DM30 of the Croydon Local Plan (LP)(2018). When read together, these policies seek to ensure that developments are of a high quality design and sustainable, whilst sensitively integrating cycle parking and refuse storage in a safe and convenient location that will not be visually obtrusive.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of planning conditions. I have considered these and have imposed them where they meet the tests as set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework, amending them where necessary in the interests of clarity and precision.
10. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition specifying the plans is required in the interests of certainty. Whilst the appellant has advised that materials will match the existing building, I consider it necessary for details of the external materials to be used to be agreed, due to the architectural detailing of the front elevation. It will also be necessary to agree details of the boundary planting treatments, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
11. I have taken into account the comments made by the appellant which suggest that the refuse and cycle storage details could be constructed so as to match other such facilities that have been accepted on other parts of the building. Such details are not before me, however, and do not form part of the appeal submission. As a result, it is necessary for conditions to be imposed that require such details to be agreed prior to the occupation of the proposed flat, in

the interests of character and appearance and hygiene and to ensure adequate arrangements are made for cycle storage to ensure the proposal accords with policies DM13 and DM30 of the LP.

Other Matter

12. The Council have suggested that the proposal may affect the outlook from the upper floors of the neighbouring property No 236 Portland Road (No 236), in particular due to a proposed balcony to the rear. This balcony would be centrally located within the rear elevation of the proposed flat however and would be sufficiently set away from No 236. As a result, such an arrangement would not harm the outlook of the occupiers of No 236.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Jamie Reed

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: P9/008/Rev B, P9/009/Rev A, P9/010/Rev A, P9/011/Rev A, P9/012/Rev B, P9/013/Rev A.
- 3) No development shall take place until details of all external materials to be used on the development including the proposed elevational treatment to the building and window treatment have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.
- 4) The development shall not be occupied until details of the refuse and cycle storage facilities, including measures to screen these, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The refuse and cycle storage facilities and associated screening shall then be completed in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied and be retained as such thereafter.

*****End of Conditions*****