



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2021

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal A - Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3256361

3 Cranbourne Close, Norbury, London SW16 4NG

- 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 Mario Jedrzejewski against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 20/01062/HSE, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2020.
- The development proposed is alterations to existing roof to include the erection of a dormer extension in the rear roofslope.

Appeal B - Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3256382

3 Cranbourne Close, Norbury, London SW16 4NG

- 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 Mario Jedrzejewski against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref 20/01063/HSE, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2020.
- The development proposed is alterations to existing roof to include increased ridge and eaves height and erection of dormer extension in the rear roofslope.

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to existing roof to include increased ridge and eaves height and erection of dormer extension in the rear roofslope at 3 Cranbourne Close, Norbury, London, SW16 4NG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01063/HSE, dated 4 March 2020, subject to the conditions set out below.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the descriptions of development from the Council's decision notices as they more concisely describe the proposals.

Main Issue

4. The main issues common to both appeals are the effects on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a mid-terrace, two storey dwelling within a modern residential area that is not designated for any landscape or townscape importance. It is in a tucked away location within the housing estate, visible

- from the front but with views of the rear difficult to obtain from public vantage points.
6. Appeal A would introduce a roof extension on the rear that would be higher than the existing ridge height. Owing to its siting, form and design, it would appear a top-heavy, incongruous and insensitive addition.
 7. Due to the gently sloping topography, the roof ridges of the short terrace are stepped. Appeal B would involve a minor increase in the overall eaves and ridge height to match that of the adjacent dwelling (No 2). The increase in the height would alter the stepped nature of the terrace roof form to a minor degree. The proposal would also introduce a flat roof dormer the full width of the rear roof plane. It would not protrude above the new ridge height and would thus not appear in views from the front of the dwelling.
 8. The Croydon Suburban Design Guide (2019) (DG) provides detail on the ways in which the quality of design required by the Local Plan¹ can be achieved. The DG states that dormer extensions should ideally be located on the rear elevation of a dwelling to minimise impact on the street and that they may be full-width for mid-terrace houses. Whilst the minor raising of the overall roof form would be required to ensure that it is no higher than the existing ridge-line, the roof form would still be in proportion with the dwelling and would not have a notable effect on the composition of the terrace as a whole.
 9. In conclusion, Appeal A would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with, in particular, Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Local Plan which together, seek to achieve development of a high quality that respects and enhances the varied local character. For similar reasons, it would conflict with the DG which seeks to ensure that dormer extensions do not exceed the existing ridge height.
 10. Conversely, Appeal B would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area and would thus comply with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan. The proposal would also adhere to the guidance in the DG.

Conditions

11. In addition to the statutory time limit, a condition is necessary to specify the approved plans in the interests of certainty.
12. It is also necessary to condition that the materials of construction match those in the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, Appeal A is dismissed.
14. For the reasons also set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, Appeal B is allowed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR

¹ Croydon Local Plan 2018

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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:
 - Location and block plan, Ref 1186 01, dated 15/01/20;
 - Elevations & section A-A as proposed, Ref 11686 08, dated 05/02/20;
 - Plans as proposed, Ref 11686 07 Rev A, dated 05/02/20.
- 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.