

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26TH February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/23/3324917

263 Parchmore Road, Thornton Heath, Croydon CR7 8HH

- 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 Ms S Balluck against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application, Ref. 23/00340/FUL, dated 27 January 2023 was refused by notice dated 17 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion to the first floor maisonette and a single storey side extension/porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is **dismissed** as regards the proposed loft conversion to the first floor maisonette but is **allowed** and planning permission granted for a single storey side extension/porch at 263 Parchmore Road, Thornton Heath, Croydon in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 23/00340/FUL, dated 27 January 2023 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The construction of the single storey side extension/porch shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing Nos. 20060-01; 20060 & 20060-05;
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the single storey side extension/porch shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Parchmore Road.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the first floor maisonette is primarily the upper floor of one half of a semi-detached pair of Nos. 257/259 and 261/263. On this side of Parchmore Road there is a considerable length of semi-detached pairs of flats interspersed with terraces of four and all of the same design.
 4. The ends of the pairs and terraces have matching front gables and side hips that present a particularly pleasing symmetry and rhythm to the road. Because of this, the proposed hip to gable roof extension would stand out as an
-

exception to the character and appearance of the street scene and draw the eye as having an unacceptably harmful effect.

5. Moreover, the design itself, combined with the large rear dormer covering most of the rear roof plane including the extended area, would be a noticeably bulky addition detrimental to the host building. The effect would also be to unbalance the semi-detached pair and if allowed would make it difficult for the Council to resist further such alterations.
6. I therefore agree with the Council's view that the harm to this building and the street scene would be contrary to Policies SP4.1, SP4 & DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. The proposal would also conflict with the Council's residential design guidance and with Government policy in Section 12 of the Planning Policy Framework 2023.
7. The grounds of appeal suggest that the Council has refused permission for the hip to gable element of the scheme because the leasehold tenure of No. 263 precludes the application of permitted development rights. However, I am satisfied that this is a misunderstanding of the situation and having read the Officer's Report carefully I consider that the application has been properly processed within the parameters of planning law and that, correctly, no weight has been given to the tenure of the property.
8. The Council has analysed the impact of the proposed ground floor extension and I agree with the assessment that this would have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building, the street scene and the outlook of neighbours. I have therefore granted permission for this part of the application only, subject to conditions to ensure that the development is consistent with the plans and the addition harmonises with the building.
9. However, as regards the remainder of the appeal proposal, for the reasons explained the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR