
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2017

by Beverley Doward BSc BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3179659

33 Bramleyhyrst, Bramley Hill, South Croydon, CR2 6LL

- 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 I Muhammad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 17/02036/HSE, dated 20 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is raising ridge of roof and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a single storey end of terrace dwelling within a residential area. The dwelling is one of three single storey dwellings which are arranged in an L shape. They are sited at the back of a garage court on the Bramleyhyrst Estate and are accessed off a private road.
4. The proposal seeks to increase the height of the roof of the appeal property and to erect two dormer extensions on its rear roof slope and a roof light on its front roof slope.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document No 2 (SPD) indicates that roof extensions such as dormer windows should ideally be located on the rear elevation of a dwelling and should not dominate the original building. It states that the extension should not normally be more than two thirds the width of the existing roof and should not be higher than the existing ridge line. The Council does not object as such to the two box-style dormers proposed on the rear roof slope which it indicates would be only slightly wider than two thirds of the roof, would not dominate the roof and would not be visible from the public realm but rather to the proposed increase to the height of the roof to facilitate the dormer extensions.
6. The appeal proposal would increase the ridge height of the roof of the dwelling by 1 metre thereby changing the roof scape of the terrace and interrupting its symmetry. I acknowledge that the front extension of the dwelling at the other

end of the terrace (No 35) has changed the appearance of the terrace somewhat. However, the ridge height of the main roof has not been altered thereby the symmetry with the other two dwellings has been maintained. Furthermore the ridge height of the roof of the extension on No 35 is set lower than that of the original dwelling such that it appears subservient to the host dwelling. The appeal proposal would instead appear dominant and awkward to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and the remainder of the terrace. Whilst the visibility of the proposal from the wider surrounding area would be restricted due to the backland nature of the site it would nevertheless be visible from the immediate surrounding area at the end of the private road.

7. Having regard to all of the above therefore, on balance I consider that the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to policy SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013, policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan: The Croydon Plan 2006 and policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for London (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011). Taken together these policies require development to be of a high quality design appropriate to its context, that reinforces and respects the existing development pattern, respects the height and proportions of surrounding buildings, takes into account local character and has regard to the form, function and structure of an area and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings.
8. The appellant contends that there are many properties elsewhere within Croydon with similar roof arrangements to that proposed here. However, I have not been provided with the details of these so cannot be satisfied that the circumstances are the same as in this case. The situation on Borough Hill referred to by the appellant does not seem the same as in this case as the dwellings along the road are stepped because of the topography of the land.
9. I note the support expressed for the proposal by the occupiers of the other dwellings in the terrace and that there is nothing in the evidence to suggest that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of these dwellings. However, these factors do not serve to outweigh the harm that I have found above.
10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Doward

INSPECTOR