
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Gwyn Clark BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/17/3171210

1 Dunheved Road West, Thornton Heath CR7 6AP

- 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 Jaweed Qureshi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/02294/P, dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is 1st floor side extension to form one bedroom and one bathroom.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 1 Dunheved Road West is described as one of a pair of semi-detached Edwardian villas. Along with its neighbour it is an impressively designed and detailed property built in a highly distinctive style. From the large bay window at ground floor the windows diminish in size through the three floors ending with a striking roof dormer which stands flush with the front façade of the dwelling capped by a stone pediment. The two semi-detached houses are in almost perfect symmetry and together they are very imposing upon the character of this area.
4. The general area is mixed in character. Opposite there is a block of two and three storey flats with roofs of varying pitch. Further along from these flats there is a row of four houses which have hipped roofs which reflect their own distinctive post-war suburban design. Other than this example, hipped roofs are rarely found. The predominant roof form is one finished with simple gables.
5. On the same side of Dunheved Road West as the appeal property the distinctive style established by it and its partner is replicated in the next pair of houses, although somewhat diminished by a more modern dormer extension. Strong features of the distinctive design can be seen in the block of terraced dwellings further along the Road.

6. In the other direction, adjacent to No 1, a short lane gives access to an area used for garaging. Beyond this lies the rear gardens of Dunheved Close. Because of this the appeal dwelling and particularly its end gable assumes a very prominent position within the street scene. Pipework serving bathroom fittings and a box-like rear dormer do somewhat detract from the appearance. Nevertheless the plain gable is a strong and important element of the overall design and appearance of the appeal property and No 1 makes an important, positive contribution to the overall character of the area.
7. The first-floor extension proposed would be added to this prominent gable end. It would sit above the existing flat roofed garage, though now utilised as living accommodation, and would be finished with a hipped roof. The overall effect of this extension would be to unacceptably imbalance the symmetry of this pair of houses and detract from their character. The hipped nature of the roof would appear a discordant addition to the dwelling and it would appear incongruous and out of place when viewed from the wider area. It would as a consequence fail to meet the requirement of policy 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015), policy SP4.1 the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies (2013), and policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006) which collectively seek a high quality design for new development that respects and enhances local character.
8. I have considered other concerns raised within the context of the planning application and this appeal although I note that they do not feature with the reasons given for refusing the planning application. Concern has been expressed that the extension would lead to a loss of privacy, but I find that as windows are only proposed to the front and rear I do not consider that significant harm would arise in this respect. A lack of vehicle parking has been raised as a concern but I consider it unlikely that the addition of a single bedroom to the appeal property would increase the need for car parking. Three spaces are currently provided and I note that other measures could be taken to control parking in the area. I find that the evidence presented is not sufficient to demonstrate that the level of disturbance in the area would change as a result of the addition of one bedroom and bathroom, given that the additional activity from these would not be likely to be significant.
9. Despite the lack of harm I have identified in respect of these matters I consider that the proposed extension would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area and consequently I dismiss the appeal.

Gwyn Clark

INSPECTOR