The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3309549
23 Stanford Road, Norbury, SW16 4PZ.

- 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 Tajul Islam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 22/00677/HSE, dated 17 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2022.
- The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear extension and erection of new single storey 4.0m rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing rear extension and erection of new single storey 4.0m rear extension at 23 Stanford Road, Norbury, SW16 4PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00677/HSE, dated 17 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

    3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: TP10, TP11, TP12, TP13, TP14, TP15, TP16, TP17 and a Streetwise Maps Ltd. location plan scale at 1:1250.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of the extension's potential to appear visually dominant and result in a loss of outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 23 Standford Road, is a two-storey end of terrace house. It is located in a residential street characterised by two-storey dwellings. There is an existing virtually full width single story rear extension, with a sloping translucent plastic roof. Form the evidence I note that this projects

approximately 3.3 metres or so into the garden from the rear wall of the dwelling and is about 2.8 metres high.

4. The appellant proposes replacing this extension with a new full width flat roof addition that would be 4.0 metres deep and about 3.3 metres high.

5. The proposed extension would be slightly closer to the common boundary to number 25, it would be about 0.7 metres deeper and some 0.7 metres higher. I accept that, in respect of the adjacent ground floor window, like the existing addition, the proposed addition would cross a line extended at 45 degrees from that window.

6. Nevertheless, given the limited change in height, depth and distance of the extension from the common boundary, and while having due regard to orientation of the dwellings one to another and the overall depth of the rear garden of 25 I am not persuaded that the resultant loss of outlook and dominance would, in this case, be so significant as to result in material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 25.

7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension would not cause significant harm the living conditions of the occupiers of number 25 in terms of visually dominance or loss of outlook. The proposal would therefore accord with the aims of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (Adopted March 2021) and Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (Adopted 27 February 2018) as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

Conditions

8. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.

9. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR