
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/19/3229272

4 Haslemere Road, Thornton Heath CR7 7BE

- 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 Mohammed Ayaz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/00740/HSE, dated 16 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of loft into habitable space including a rear dormer and building over the existing first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace two storey dwelling within a residential street of similar properties. At the rear of the terrace it is possible to see other dormer window extensions which have been constructed on neighbouring properties. The other dormers are generally in proportion and scale with their host properties and this creates a uniformity in terms of scale, position and proportion. This adds positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal is for a rear L-shaped dormer window which would be built across the full width of the existing roof slope and would extend over the existing rear extension. It is also proposed to include two rooflights in the front roofslope.
5. Policies DM10 and SP4 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) require development to be of a high-quality design with appropriate scale, height and massing and detailed guidance can be found in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Suburban Design Guide 2019 (SPD). In addition, policy DM10.7 of the LP seeks to ensure that designs of roof forms are sympathetic to its local context. These policies are consistent with the design aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (March 2016).
6. The SPD at chapter 4.21 Extensions and Alterations to Roofs requires roof extensions to enlarge the useable floor space within a loft and sets out the

requirements for the design and scale of dormer windows. In particular, the SPD permits full width dormers on the rear of mid-terraced dwellings, but this would not apply to dormers which would seek to utilise space beyond the main roof of the property.

7. The part of the proposed dormer window which would extend over the existing roof extension is built on top of the roof and therefore would not utilise any existing floor space, this is in conflict with the guidance within the SPD. The dormer would result in a top heavy and dominant addition on the rear of the host property and depart significantly from the scale, appearance and proportions of most of the other dormer windows which are present in the terrace.
8. I have been provided with a list of other similar dormer extensions, however it was not possible to view all of these from the public realm. However, those which were visible from the street or the appeal site were not of a similar design to that proposed. Consequently, the development would look materially out of place within its immediate setting.
9. Despite the use of matching materials, the dormer would be an unduly dominant and incongruous feature. Although views of the dormer from the street would be limited to glimpsed views from Bensham Lane, it would be clearly visible from a number of neighbouring properties and their gardens. In any event, limited public visibility would not obviate the need for the development to be of high-quality design.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed L-shaped dormer, due to its scale and incongruous design would adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and therefore would not accord with the design requirements of policies D10 and SP4 of the LP, the SPD and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan. Whilst the front rooflights would be acceptable from a character and appearance point of view, this would not alter or overcome my identified concerns relating to the L-shaped dormer.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that when the proposal is considered as a whole the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR