The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Gwyn Clark BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3172868
80 Grecian Crescent, Upper Norwood, 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 17/00346/HSE, dated 24 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2017.
- The development proposed is loft conversion with a hipped gable end on both sides of the house with two Velux windows to the front and back slope.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a loft conversion with a hipped gable end on both sides of the house with two Velux windows to the front and back slope at 80 Grecian Crescent, Upper Norwood, London SE19 3HH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/00346/HSE, dated 24 January 2017, subject to the following conditions:

    1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2. The proposed development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the proposals contained in the application and the plans submitted, reference 16321/01A, 16321/02A, 16321/03A, 1657/03 and 1657/04A.

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

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the roof extension upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Grecian Crescent is a residential road of very mixed character. In a very recent appeal decision[1] at No 80, the Inspector noted that there is a mix of styles of

[1] Appeal Reference App/L5240/D/16/3161826 dated 9 January 2017

roof treatment too and I agree. While a hipped style of roof predominates in the Crescent there are also examples of gable-end roofs.

4. The proposal considered in that recent appeal was to add a gable extension to one side of the roof of No 80 which is a detached dwelling. This would have resulted in it having a gable matching one neighbour and a hipped roof matching the other. The Inspector concluded that this combination of roof on a single house would appear jarring and consequently the appeal was dismissed. It is now proposed to extend the roof with a gable on both sides, and with a flat 'table-top' at the ridge.

5. This small length of Grecian Crescent has experienced a significant change in character in recent years. No 80 is a new house that has been recently constructed in a gap formally occupied by garages to the side of No 78. This house (No 78) has also been substantially extended, including a rear two storey flat roofed extension and a gable-end dormer roof extension. The semi-detached houses on the other side of No 80 remain in their original form with a hipped roof but at the end of this short row, No's 86 and 88 both have had substantial flat roofed dormer roof extensions added.

6. The roof of No 80 in its extended form would appear visually balanced. Its gable–end style would also reflect that of its neighbour No 78. In the other direction there is a small but sufficient gap for the change in roof style from gable to hipped not to appear visually jarring.

7. The roof would also feature a 'table top' style flat ridge. This is not characteristic of the area. However the roof would be the same height as its neighbour, No 78, and from street level would not appear different. Where the difference could be in view, particularly through the gaps between the houses, it will appear within the context of this small row of houses most having been extended using flat roofs.

8. Consequently I consider that the extension to the roof would not prove harmful to the character of the local area or impact adversely upon the appearance of this part of Grecian Crescent. When considered against the design related policies of the London Plan (Polices 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6), Policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan, and saved policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan I find that it would comply with their broad intention to secure a high standard of design in new development and one that respects and enhances the varied character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the potential for the extension to have an adverse impact upon the privacy of immediate neighbours on Grecian Crescent and upon residents of Queen Mary Road. This extension would have 'Velux' style windows added to the roof plane at the front and rear. I do not consider that this would lead to a harmful effect on living conditions due to the distance between the neighbours on Queen Mary Road and because this type of window does not offer the same degree of outlook as vertical hung windows. Neither do I consider that the extension would be physically imposing.

10. I find that the evidence presented is not sufficient to demonstrate that there would be an increased pressure upon car parking or that noise would increase

as a result of the addition of one bedroom and bathroom, given that the additional activity would not be likely to be significant.

Conclusion

11. I consider that within the context of this short row of houses along Grecian Crescent and in the wider street scene the roof extension proposed would be in keeping with the character of the area. Accordingly I allow this appeal and grant planning permission. Conditions are imposed to add clarity to the planning permission and to ensure that materials used match those of the existing roof, safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Gwyn Clark

INSPECTOR