
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 09 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3158129

1 Godson Road, Croydon CR0 4LT

- 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 Tony Miller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/02976/P, dated 10 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is an L-shaped rear dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the main dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling which incorporates a back to back rear addition. The side elevation of the dwelling is very prominent when viewed from around the junction of Godson Road and Courtney Road. From there the ridge line of the rear addition can be seen as lower than and subordinate to that of the main roof.
 4. Despite being set in from the side elevation and below the ridgeline of the main roof, the dormer extension would project above the roof of the rear addition. Furthermore, the part which would adjoin the rear roof slope of the main dwelling would cover a significant portion of the roof area. In combination, the proportions of the proposed rear roof extension would appear to dominate the existing dwelling in what is a very prominent location.
 5. I accept that the proposal, incorporating matching materials, would be similar in design to roof extensions elsewhere in the street. However these existing extensions are screened from prominent public viewpoints by the existing built frontage. By contrast, the structure in this case would draw the eye as a dominant feature which would not appear subordinate in scale to the main dwelling.
 6. In itself, the proposed hip to gable extension would not be significant in scale. Seen directly from the front, this element of the extension would be
-

substantially obscured by the existing forward projecting gable over the bay windows. Accordingly, any sense of a loss of symmetry between the appeal dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached unit would be minimal and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the street. Furthermore, it was apparent from my visit that hipped roof ends are not a strong characteristic feature within the wider street scene. This, however, does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above in terms of the scale of the proposed dormer extension.

7. I sympathise with the fact that the proposal is intended to increase the amount of accommodation within the dwelling in order to enhance the living conditions of the occupiers. I also acknowledge that there have been no objections to the proposal as a result of the consultation exercise undertaken. This however does not justify the harm I have identified.
8. For the aforementioned reasons, I conclude that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene. Accordingly it would conflict with Policy SP4 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013, Saved Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document No 2 Residential Extensions and Alterations which seek to promote good design; development to respect the character of the area and roof forms to respect those of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR