



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

**Decision by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14 July 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3246073**

**134 Ridge Langley, South Croydon CR2 0AS**

- 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 Felix Manoharan against the decision of the London Borough of Croydon Council.
  - The application Ref 19/05476/HSE, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
  - The development proposed is the erection of front dormer and internal alterations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of front dormer and internal alterations at 134 Ridge Langley, Croydon, CR2 0AS, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/05476/HSE, dated 19 November 2019 and 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 100 (Location Plan), 102 (Existing Floor Plans), 103 (Existing Elevations), 200 (Proposed Floor Plans), 201 (Proposed Elevations), 202 (Roof Plans).
  - 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.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issues

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

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling which lies within a triangular plot on the southern side of Ridge Langley, a winding circular road within an established residential area. The appeal dwelling, located in the bend
-

- of the road, is similar in character to other houses along the street in that it features a prominent elongated front roof spanning from the first floor to the ground floor garage. Other properties in the vicinity of the appeal dwelling are designed with a gable end instead of the elongated roof feature.
5. The proposal would result in the erection of a pitched roof dormer to the front roof slope above the existing garage. The plans indicate it would be finished with hanging tiles, aluminium windows and roof tiles to match existing. Whilst the Council asserts that the proposed dormer would harm the appearance of the street scene as it would disrupt the rhythm of the roofline along this stretch of Ridge Langley, I find that it would adequately harmonise with the existing built form. I concur with the appellant in that the proposed pitched dormer would reflect the pitched gable ends of the nearby properties at Nos. 130 and 138.
  6. Although the development would be easily visible within the street scene and would alter the existing rhythm of the roof form along this part of the road, it would appear as a modest and proportionate extension. Indeed, it would not extend across the full width of the roof, it would be set back from the eaves and its design attempts to mirror neighbouring gables. Therefore, whilst the proposal would introduce a new element to the rhythm of the roof form, it would be a sufficiently coherent element and would thus not erode the symmetry of the built form in the immediate vicinity. I note that the Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that front dormers are 'generally' not acceptable. However, in this instance, I consider the development would not negatively impact the appearance of the street and would therefore benefit from exceptional circumstances.
  7. I am satisfied the proposal would adequately tie-in with the existing dwelling and would not result in a visually discordant feature that would unbalance the rhythm of the built form along this section of the street.
  8. Given the above, the proposed development would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area and would not conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which together seek to ensure proposals show high quality design, and respect the character and appearance of the area and the street scene. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to ensure proposals are sympathetic to local character. I have also had regard to the Suburban Design Guide (SPD) which seeks the same.

### **Conditions**

9. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty.
10. I have also added a condition recommended by the Council which requires the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development match those used in the existing building in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

### **Recommendation**

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

*Thomas Courtney*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

*Claire Searson*

INSPECTOR