



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 MARCH 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/21/3276668

76 Rickman Hill, Coulsdon CR5 3DP

- 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 Sukhraj Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/00377/FUL, dated 27 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of proposed 3 Bed/4 Person double storey residential dwelling adjoining existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the adequacy of parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 76 Rickman Hill lies at the corner of Rickman Hill and Ridgemount Avenue. With neighbouring 74 Rickman Hill, the house at No 76 forms a pair of hipped roofed, two storey semi-detached dwellings of brick and tile construction. The appeal site comprises No 76 and its front, side and rear gardens. This appeal site sits within a corner plot at the junction where Ridgemount Avenue joins Rickman Hill.
4. Properties along this side of Rickman Hill are generously set back from the highway and a strong building line exists. Within the immediate area, semi-detached dwellings of similar character and appearance define this side of Rickman Hill. Properties in Ridgemount Avenue are also two storey semi-detached dwellings set back from the highway with a strong building line. However, there is more variation in materials.

5. It is proposed to demolish the existing single storey side projection attached to No 76 and erect a two-storey house attached to No 76. This would result in a terrace with Nos 74 and 76.
6. The proposed development would follow the two-storey footprint with the first-floor front and rear walls also aligning with the existing front and rear walls of Nos 74 and 76. This would therefore respect the established building line of Rickman Hill. Materials would match and the overall design, including the roof height and design, take its design cues from the existing dwelling at No 76. The appeal proposal is therefore sympathetic to its context in terms of its similar design and form.
7. However, the creation of a terraced row of properties would not follow the established wider character of two storey semi-detached dwellings. This would not be sympathetic to the wider pattern of semi-detached dwellings. Even when taking account of the separation distance between the proposed development and the dwellings in Ridgemount Avenue, the appeal proposal would still be visible and would breach the strong building line of Ridgemount Avenue. All these features in combination would be harmful to the pattern of development within the area.
8. Page 50 of the Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance 2019 (the SPD) gives guidance for corner plot developments. Paragraph 2.14.2 of the SPD states that such proposals need to be responsive to neighbouring properties, respond to the positioning of neighbouring front elevations, and contribute positively to the townscape. The SPD states that such proposals will be judged on a case-by-case basis. While I have had regard to this section of the SPD, I have found harm above in respect of the effect of the proposal not being responsive to neighbouring properties or contributing positively to the townscape.
9. I accept that the density of the proposal would allow for efficient use of land. It would maintain a distinction between private and public space with such private amenity space and internal space compliant with current standards. I am also aware landscaping is proposed to be retained and further landscaping could be controlled by the imposition of conditions. These benefits carry some weight; however, they do not outweigh the harm I have identified on this main issue.
10. The proposed development would therefore harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan), Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 (the London Plan), and the SPD all of which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is appropriate and sympathetic in relation to the character and appearance of the area.

Parking provision

11. The development proposal, a 3-bed dwelling, makes no provision for off street parking. The Council state the site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 1A, which indicates very poor access to public transport links. The Council is concerned that an increase in parking pressures associated with the new dwelling would unreasonably impact on the parking stress level of the surrounding roads to the detriment of the highway conditions of the area.

12. While it was only a snapshot in time, during my site visit I noted that parking was moderate in the area. However, this was a Tuesday morning and could not be said to be representative of parking levels over time.
13. The carparking sections in the SPD indicate at paragraph 2.30.7 and 2.30.8 that on street parking may be acceptable where it is deemed safe. In these cases, such development proposals must be supported by a documented parking assessment demonstrating compliance with Lambeth Methodology. The SPD also confirms applications will be judged on a case-by-case basis.
14. The appellant has submitted a parking survey as part of this appeal. However, it is not clear that the survey is compliant with Lambeth Methodology. Such detail would include how the extent of survey, exclusions, survey times, and survey days meet the Lambeth Methodology. Given the appeal is not supported by a documented parking assessment demonstrating that there is kerbside capacity for car parking using the Lambeth Methodology, the appeal fails to demonstrate the impact on the parking stress level of the surrounding roads.
15. Limited information is given on what public transport services are available locally and how frequent they are. Given the PTAL rating of the site, it is likely that public transport is not of a frequency and connectivity to effectively reduce reliance on the private car.
16. I am also advised that the local roads are not subject to parking restrictions or controlled parking zones. However, this does not indicate that the local roads necessarily have capacity for further parking.
17. In conclusion, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would make adequate parking provision. This would conflict with Policies SP8, DM29 and DM30 of the Local Plan, Policy T6 of the London Plan, and the SPD all of which, amongst other things, seek to ensure proposals provide adequate parking provision and are not harmful to local highway conditions.

Other Matters

18. Concerns have been raised by interested parties in respect to land drainage, noise, light and privacy, however, given my findings on the main issues there is no need for me to consider these further.

Conclusion

19. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR