



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by L Reid BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/23/3320649

Land rear of 56-59 Central Parade, New Addington CR0 0JD

- 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 John McMillan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/05734/FUL, dated 16 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of an single storey 3 bedroom dwelling, parking, gardens, bin/cycle storage and use of existing access road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and whether appropriate living conditions would be provided for future occupiers having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site lies at the rear of Central Parade. It is used as a parking area and is accessed via a shared service access from Salcot Crescent.
4. The prevailing pattern of development surrounding the site consists of frontage buildings. The buildings along Central Parade are typically set within long plots, some of which have rear extensions that extend to varying depths, and outbuildings in the yard. Adjacent to the appeal site are the rear gardens of the houses which front Salcot Crescent.
5. The proposal would introduce a single storey dwelling behind the existing row of buildings. I saw no evidence on site and nor is there any substantive evidence before me, that there are other examples of buildings that are independent of the frontage buildings and form a separate site for residential use. Although the building would be close to the houses on Salcot Crescent, it would not relate to these houses as its frontage would be towards the access road. Consequently, the erection of a separate residential unit would be contrary to the prevailing pattern of development.
6. The scale and massing of the proposed dwelling would be relative to the size of the plot. The submitted proposed block plan demonstrates that the dwelling would not be cramped within the site and there would be sufficient space around it, with a distance of over 1.5m between the dwelling and boundary

treatment. However, notwithstanding these elements, how the dwelling would be accessed via the shared access, without any form of street facing frontage, could not be held to constitute good design, given the local context.

7. The character of the appeal site would change considerably from an open car park to a separate dwelling with its own access and garden area. Although the dwelling would be set into the site, it would be visible in some views along Salcot Crescent. The dwelling would have a domestic appearance, as opposed to an outbuilding or extension used in connection with Central Parade. Given the open location, it would be viewed as a standalone dwelling which would highlight its discordant relationship with the rear streetscene. Accordingly, despite its single storey height, the dwelling would be incongruous in this context.
8. No. 60 Central Parade has previously been extended. However, the location of the extensions is more compatible with the pattern of development. As such, I do not regard it as a precedent for the appeal scheme.
9. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 (the LP), Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (the CLP) and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Amongst other things, these policies seek development that respects the development pattern, layout and siting and is sympathetic to the existing character to enhance the local context.

Living conditions for future occupiers

10. The point of contention between the two main parties relates to the outlook from the window serving the second bedroom due to its distance from the adjacent boundary.
11. There would be a distance of at least 6.4m between the window and the adjacent boundary treatment. This is sufficient space to allow landscaping as part of the front garden and means that the outlook would not be severely enclosed. This is also a similar distance from the other front window to the boundary.
12. I, therefore, find that the proposal would provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers having particular regard to outlook and would not conflict with Policies D3 and D6 of the LP, Policies SP2 and DM10 of the CLP and the guidance contained in the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016. Collectively, these policies and guidance seek housing development to be of a high standard with an appropriate outlook.

Other Matters

13. The Council referred to Policy D5 of the LP in its reason for refusal relating to character and appearance. From the evidence before me, this policy relates to inclusive design, and it is not clear that this policy relates specifically to the issues raised. It has therefore not been determinative in my assessment.
14. There are no objections on the grounds of the size of rooms and garden area, cycle parking, waste and transport matters, and sustainable drainage and energy efficiency measures could be incorporated into the scheme. However,

the provision of these in a satisfactory manner is to be expected of all development and is of a neutral weight in this appeal.

15. These matters would therefore not alter my conclusions on the merits of the proposal.

Planning Balance

16. The proposal would provide an additional home in a sustainable location and would make a more efficient use of the land than its current use, as supported by Policies H1 and H2 of the LP.
17. There would also be social and economic benefits arising from the construction period and the spending of future occupiers would give support to local services and facilities. Notwithstanding this, any construction benefits would be modest and short term and one dwelling would make only a very minor contribution to the overall supply of housing. I give these benefits only limited weight. I note that the proposal would be liable for a Community Infrastructure Levy payment which would contribute to funding the infrastructure needed to support development. However, this weighs neutrally in the planning balance.
18. Whilst the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This therefore outweighs the benefits that would arise from the additional dwelling created.
19. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate this appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

20. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

L Reid

INSPECTOR