

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/19/3231926

185 Upper Selsdon Road, South Croydon, CR2 0DY

- 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 & Mrs Poonam Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/00812/HSE, dated 20 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double hip to gable and rear dormer loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double hip to gable and rear dormer loft extension at 185 Upper Selsdon Road, South Croydon, CR2 0DY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00812/HSE, dated 20 February 2019, 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: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250 and Drg Nos 1946/02, 1946/03, 1946/04, 1946/13A, 1946/14B, 1946/15C and 1946/16C.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. I saw during my visit that building work was underway for what appeared to be a rear extension. These works are not shown on the appeal drawings and my decision is based upon the scheme that was submitted to the local planning authority and shown on the planning application drawings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 185 Upper Selsdon Road and the wider street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling occupying a corner plot at the junction of Upper Selsdon Road with Wisborough Road. The area is residential in character with dwellings to one side of the road and which are set behind a service road that runs parallel to the main highway. Although there are many repeat dwelling types, with hipped roof forms most prevalent, there is notable variation between neighbouring properties, with gables prominent to the front of many such that these are not alien design features in the area. Indeed, side gabled roofs are dominant to the dwellings in the view into Wisborough Road when looking from Upper Selsdon Road and within the same visual context as the appeal property. Moreover, I could detect no important sense of uniformity or regimentation to the architecture in the area, with No 185 already unique in its form, showing how individual property types successfully assimilate themselves into the locality.
5. The hip to gable alterations would undeniably remodel the shape of the appeal property. However, this does not automatically equate to harm. I do not share the Council's view that the dwelling would somehow have an unacceptable amount of horizontal massing. Although the scale of the roof would be enlarged, with a significantly increased ridge line, the building would remain appropriately residential in scale and entirely proportionate. It would be different to the existing, but in my opinion, given the use of matching materials for the overall finish of the property, which would harmonise with others nearby, it would not appear incongruous or out of keeping amongst the building variations that exist along this part of Upper Selsdon Road or the wider context.
6. The Council is satisfied that the proposed rear dormer window would be well situated within the roof slope and that it would be of an acceptable scale and mass. I do not disagree.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed changes to the roof would not harm the character or appearance of 185 Upper Selsdon Road or the street scene. As such, I find no conflict with the guiding principles of the Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document No. 2* as it relates to roof extensions, or with Policies SP4.1 DM10.1 and DM10.7 of The Croydon Local Plan 2018, or Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016, insofar as they all relate to the quality of design and the need for new development to respect local character.

Other Matters

8. I have carefully considered the comments made by the immediately adjoining occupiers. I recognise that the rear elevation to the appeal property extends beyond the rear of this neighbouring dwelling. However, the gap between both properties would be unaltered and I am not persuaded by any substantive evidence that the change to the scale and height of the side elevation to No

185 would have any significant impact upon daylight to No 187, or to direct sunlight affecting the solar panels that are fitted to the rear roof slope.

9. The rear dormer would look directly towards the rear garden of the appeal site and only obliquely across the rear neighbouring garden in a manner that is typical for the area and for most suburban locations. The use of render for the proposed dormer would match the facing materials for the remainder of the house and is commonly used in the area.
10. Overall, I am satisfied that there would be no impact upon the neighbouring property that would significantly affect the occupiers' living conditions. I note also that the Council had no objection in this regard.

Conditions

11. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is necessary to control the external materials that would be used for the works.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR