

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2016

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3161826
80 Grecian Crescent, London, SE19 3HH

- 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 J Taylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/04522/HSE, dated 31 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of gable end roof extension with rooflights in front/side/rear roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more concise than the planning application form; I note the Appellant also uses this description on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey hipped roof dwelling of agreeable design and proportions and set close to the back edge of the pavement. It is in a road of established residential character with a range of mainly detached and semi-detached homes which come together to create a streetscene of pleasing appearance. The dwellings display a variety of hipped and gable end designs. The proposal is as described above and would create at attic level one new main room with a bathroom alongside.
 5. The proposal would result in this dwelling having a hip to one side and gable to the other. I can quite see what the Appellant has sought to do with the planned creation of a asymmetrical roof. It would, with each side taken in isolation, reflect the gable to one neighbouring property and the hipped roof to the other. However the outcome would simply be a single detached dwelling which would look poorly designed and be jarring on the eye. The visual qualities, balance, symmetry and spacing of the existing dwelling and its design would be lost. Unfortunately, and even with the use of matching materials,
-

this poorly designed edifice would appear odd in its own right and be readily apparent in the streetscene and aesthetically detrimental to the wider locality.

6. Policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, Policies H2, UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013 and London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 are of relevance. They share common themes of seeking high quality design to protect or enhance the character and appearance of buildings and their neighbourhood, to ensure harmonious development. I conclude that the development would run contrary to these policies.

Other matters

7. I understand the wish of the Appellant to increase internal space. I would agree with the Appellant that there are no over-riding issues of neighbouring amenity reasonably at play here. The additional built form would not be unduly physically imposing upon nearby residents and the planned cabrio balcony and additional windows would be sufficiently distant from sensitive receptors or could be subject to obscure glazing / opening restrictions. I appreciate that there is some scope at times to undertake broadly comparable hip to gable work as 'permitted development'. However that is not the case here and I have a planning appeal before me to determine on its own merits bearing in mind the reasonable objective of applicable planning policy to secure good quality design. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Councils' policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR