
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24/06/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/20/3266086

112 Grange Park Road, Thornton Heath, Croydon CR7 8QB

- 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 Beauman Estates Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/03876/FUL, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is use as a HMO for 8 occupants.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development which is the subject of the appeal has already taken place.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are, i) whether the development gives rise to the loss of a dwelling which should otherwise be protected and ii) the effects on car parking.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this end-of-terrace house which is located within a residential area. The house has evidently been extended in the recent past. Policy DM1.2 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) seeks to retain and provide family homes and states that the Council will permit the redevelopment of residential units where it does not result in the net loss of 3 bedroom homes (as originally built) or the loss of homes smaller than 130sqm.
5. The original house at the appeal site had 3 bedrooms and a floor area of less than 130sqm. The appellant confirms that as a result of extensions, the floor area is 153sqm and it provided 5 bedrooms, prior to conversion to a HMO.
6. The wording of Policy DM1.2 is clear in that the size of the dwelling under consideration is as it was originally built, prior to any extensions. I have no doubt that it was specifically worded to take account of situations such as this, where a 'small' property was then subsequently extended. Although I understand the appellant's statements relating to the existing size of the property, there is clear conflict with Policy DM1.2 and the development has resulted in the loss of a dwelling which is protected by this policy.

7. In relation to car parking, the appeal site can accommodate 1 off-street space and some cycle provision is made. The Council has indicated within its submissions that, in the absence of any assessment of parking by the appellant, that they are unconvinced that there would be no harm to parking availability in the area. In my consideration, and particularly as the development has already been completed, some responsibility must rest with the Council to make a clear allegation of harm and conflict with a relevant policy, rather than the unsubstantiated statement that has been made. In this circumstance, I consider that no harm in relation to parking has been demonstrated by the Council.

Conclusion

8. The development gives rise to the loss of a dwelling which is protected by Policy DM1.2. I find no other considerations which are sufficient to outweigh that conflict. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR