The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2017

by P G Horridge BSc(Hons) DipTP FRICS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3165581
23 The Woodfields, Sanderstead, South Croydon CR2 0HG

- 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 Tommy Lai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 16/04261/HSE was refused by notice dated 12 October 2016.
- The development proposed is a single storey to rear and loft conversion, including extension to hipped roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to the rear and a loft conversion, including an extension to the hipped roof, at 23 The Woodfields, Sanderstead in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04261/HSE, dated 15 August 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

    1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

    2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P-308(16)01, P-308(16)02, P-308(16)03 and P-308(16)04.

    3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. At issue is the effect of the roof extension on the appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. Relevant local planning policy is contained in the London Plan (LP) (2011), the Croydon Local Plan (CLP) (adopted 2013) and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (adopted 2006). These policies address urban design and local character (LP Policies 7.4 and 7.6 and CLP Policies SP1.2, SP4.1 and SP4.2), the layout and siting of new development (UDP Policy UD2) and the scale and design of new buildings (UDP Policy UD3). Reference is also made to the council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 (SPD) dealing with residential extensions.

4. The Woodfields is a residential road consisting of detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows of a wide variety of designs. The appeal property is a bungalow flanked by two-storey houses. The proposal is to construct a single storey extension at the rear, to which the council has no objection, and a roof extension. The latter would involve extending the existing hipped roof over the flat-roofed garage, and constructing a dormer in the rear roof slope with two rooflights in the front roof slope. The council has no objection to the dormer; it would be at the rear of the property, away from the main public views, and there are several examples of such dormers in the immediate locality.

5. The council argues that the extended roof over the garage is overly large and bulky and would dominate the original dwelling. It would indeed be slightly higher than the apex of the existing roof, contrary to guidance in SPD 2. However, since it would continue the plane of the existing front roof slope, the fact that the roof height had been increased would not be apparent. The roof of the extended building would appear no larger than is necessary to satisfactorily surmount the accommodation below. Given the wide variety in the appearance of properties in the locality, and that the properties to either side are two-storey, the enlarged building would not appear out-of-place. It would respect the scale, height and proportions of surrounding buildings in accordance with saved UDP Policy UD3 and LP Policy 7.4. It would complement and be consistent with the varied local architectural character as required by LP Policy 7.6, CLP Policies SP1.2 and SP4 and UDP Policy UD2. Any conflict with one of the guidelines in SPD 2 is outweighed by its consistency with these development plan policies and the material considerations noted above.

6. Overall the extensions would not harm the appearance of the streetscene or be contrary to relevant local planning policies taken as a whole. The appeal is therefore allowed, subject to conditions specifying the approved plans (for the avoidance of doubt and to simplify the procedures involved in making any minor amendments to the scheme) and matching materials (to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the completed development).

Peter Horridge

INSPECTOR