

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2017

by M C J Nunn BA BPL LLB LLM BCL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3167730

94 Guildford Road, Croydon, CR0 2HJ

- 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 Bonaventure Okocha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref: 16/04953/FUL, dated 23 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "erection of dormer extension in rear roof slope; provision of rooflights in front / side roof slope".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters and Main Issue

2. The description of development in the header above is taken from the Council's decision notice, and used on the appeal form, rather than that given on the planning application form. I believe it accurately describes the proposal.
3. The Council's delegated report is somewhat contradictory. On the one hand, it states that *'the design of the dormer, without any external rear facing windows is considered to not respect or enhance the character of the host building'*¹. However, the report subsequently records that *'the proposal would be of an appropriate scale and design that it would not dominate the existing dwelling'*² and rather confusingly concludes that *'it is considered that the proposal is sympathetic to the relevant policies and is therefore recommended that permission be refused'*³.
4. The single reason for refusal states that the scheme would not provide a high standard of design, nor would respect the visual character of the area. Accordingly, I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and host dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a recently constructed two storey semi-detached dwelling located at the end of Guildford Road, a cul-de-sac. The property is of

¹ Paragraph 5.3

² Paragraph 5.6

³ Paragraph 5.9

a modern appearance, rendered white and has a grey slate pitched roof. It is quite different from other dwellings in the road which comprise tightly-knit terraced properties dating from the Victorian era.

6. In my judgement, the proposed rear dormer with a single ceiling skylight but lacking any windows to its elevations would appear very odd. With its blank and featureless external faces, it would present an ugly, box-like and bulky structure, protruding from the roof. The dormer would introduce an obtrusive addition that would disrupt and distort the existing profile of the roof. I acknowledge that the dormer would be located at the rear, but it would still result in a discordant feature in the locality.
7. Consequently, I conclude that this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, and host dwelling. It would conflict with Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. These policies require proposals to reinforce and respect the existing development pattern. It would conflict with Policy SP4.1 of the Local Plan: Strategic Policies which requires high quality development that respects and enhances Croydon's varied local character. It would conflict with Policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which have similar aims. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Matthew C J Nunn

INSPECTOR