



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2019

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/19/3238122

71 Addington Road, Croydon CR0 3LW

- 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 Pui Yi Tse against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/01238/HSE, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of rear extension and front porch, at 71 Addington Road, Croydon CR0 3LW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01238/HSE, dated 13 March 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application form indicates that the development under appeal was completed on 31 December 2018. Accordingly, the Council dealt with the application on a retrospective basis, and I have done the same.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are 1) the effect of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, in terms of light and outlook; and 2) the effect of the front porch on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The appeal site occupies a corner position with the side elevation facing Hatton Road. The building includes a two storey extension, beyond which is the subject single storey, flat-roofed extension. I am referred to Supplementary Planning Document 2 on Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD), which specifies a maximum 3 metres depth for rear extensions. Whilst the cumulative depth of both extensions is said to be around 6 metres, the neighbouring properties at 73 and 75 Addington Road have also extended to a similar depth to the two storey addition at the appeal site. As such, it is only the subject single storey extension which projects beyond the prevailing rear building line of the terrace at ground floor level.
5. The extension is visible from the rear ground floor window of No 73 above the garden fence. However, it is set in slightly from the boundary with No 73 and is

modest in its height and depth, which together serve to limit its presence from the neighbouring property. Moreover, I saw that the neighbouring property has a wooden canopy structure attached to the rear wall, which partially encloses the area immediately outside the ground floor window. From my observations, this structure is likely to have an effect on the light received by, and outlook from, the neighbouring window.

6. In addition, the gable end of the property at 11 Hatton Road forms an immediate and more substantial massing to the rear of both properties. The effect of the extension at the appeal site on outlook and light is minor by comparison. However, I also saw that the outlook from No 73 in the other direction, over the gardens of Nos 75 and 77 and 11 Hatton Road, was relatively open and sunlight was being received to the ground floor of No 73.
7. In light of these factors, I find that the single storey rear extension, given its modest scale and position, and the surrounding context, does not have such an adverse effect on outlook or light as to demonstrably harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. As such, I find no conflict with Policy SP4 or Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP), which seek to deliver high quality proposals which protect the amenity of occupiers of adjoining buildings and ensure that significant loss of existing sunlight and daylight levels does not occur. Nor would there be conflict with the similar aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (March 2016) or the thrust of the guidance of the SPD.

Character and appearance

8. The front porch extends almost to the full width of the property and is just over one metre deep. I saw a large number of properties on Addington Road have added porches. In general, these are small structures just wide enough for a door. I noted that the porch obscures the original ground floor window, which most other properties have retained, except for one example at No 37. Nonetheless, the porch includes a ground floor window which, though a slightly different shape, helps to maintain the overall fenestration to the front elevation. Though wider than most other examples, the porch did not appear to me disproportionate in size, given its shallow projection. Moreover, it matches the main building in materials and finish and appears integrated with the rest of the building, unlike other examples I saw which contrast markedly in materials and appear more conspicuous as a result.
9. The street includes a wide variety of porch designs, with different materials, colours, doors and roofs. Given this diverse context, it is my judgement that the provision of a larger, but visually integrated porch at the appeal site does not harm the character and appearance of the area. No issue has been raised with the appearance of the rear extension and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policies SP4.1, SP4.2 and DM10 of the LP or Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, or with the SPD in terms of their combined aims to secure high quality design which respects the local character.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. The Council has not requested that any planning conditions be imposed as the proposal is retrospective. Therefore, I allow the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

K. Savage

INSPECTOR