



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2021

by **J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3267948

29A Cliff End, PURLEY, CR8 1BP

- 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 Sam Pitkeathly against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/04254/HSE, dated 17 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a rear dormer roof extension including rear Juliet balcony; the creation of a half-hipped roof; the insertion of a front roof light; a new side window and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a rear dormer roof extension including rear Juliet balcony; the creation of a half-hipped roof; the insertion of a front roof light; a new side window and external alterations at 29A Cliff End, PURLEY, CR8 1BP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/04254/HSE, dated 17 September 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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: Drawing No's: A.2.4a; B.EX.0.1; B.EX.0.2; B.EX.2.0; B.EX.2.1; B.EX.2.2; B.EX.2.3; B.EX.2.4; B.EX.3.1; B.EX.3.2; B.EX.3.3; B.EX.3.4; B.EX.4.1; B.EX.4.2; D.PR.0.1; D.PR.2.0; D.PR.2.1; D.PR.2.2; D.PR.2.3; D.PR.2.4; D.PR.3.1; D.PR.3.2; D.PR.3.3; D.PR.3.4; D.PR.4.1; D.PR.4.3; D.PR.4.4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, other than the side timber cladding, shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed dormer extension on the character and appearance of the area around Cliff End.

Procedural Matter

3. The decision notice refers to the proposed development as including a 'gabled roof formation'. The application form refers to a half-hipped roof, which I

consider to be a more accurate description and I have, accordingly, used that description in the heading above.

Reasons

4. No 29A Cliff End is a detached house situated on the southern side of the road. The area in which it is located is characterised by a very steep slope down from north to south, such that the houses on the south side of the road have ground floors well below the level of the road, and rear gardens well below the ground floor level. At the time of my inspection, the appeal property had a single-storey rear extension, effectively at basement level, under construction. Houses to the rear of No 29A, on Friends Road and further south, are sited significantly below the level of the appeal property.
5. Houses on Cliff End are predominantly detached with a wide variety of architectural designs and roof styles. No 29A has a hipped, pyramid-style roof with a forward projecting gable-fronted garage, effectively at first-floor level. The proposed roof alterations would include extending the roof to a half-hipped appearance, with the construction of a dormer to the rear elevation and the insertion of a roof light into the front elevation. The dormer would be set a little below the new roof ridge level and a little up from the eaves. It would drop to follow the line of the hipped roof for part of its width, but would be set in from the side elevation of the house by a small amount.
6. The council contends that the proposed development, by reason of its combined siting, height, depth and width would result in a disproportionate, dominant, visually intrusive and overbearing form of development that would harm the form, proportion and appearance of the dwelling, disrupt the prevailing pattern of development and character of the area and visual amenities of the streetscene.
7. Policy DM10.7 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) indicates that development proposals should demonstrate that the design of roof-form should be sympathetic with its local context. Section 4.21 of the Council's Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) gives guidance on roof extensions. This includes guidance that a roof extension may be no more than two-thirds the width of the existing roof on a detached house, and should be set in from the edge of a hipped roof.
8. In this case, the dormer extension would be more than two-thirds the width of the roof, although it would be set in from the edge of the hipped roof. It would appear to meet all other requirements of the design guidance.
9. The appellant refers to other recent dormer extensions at nearby houses on the south side of the road, including extensions at Nos 25A and Nos 13 and 15. I have no details as to the background of these extensions, though it would appear that all included hipped to gable extensions to the roof, and the construction of full-width and full-height box-type dormers. Whilst each case should be treated on its own merits, I note that these dormers are not prominent in the street scene and do not appear as dominating the rear elevations of the houses, particularly given the specific topography, which effectively foreshortens the view of the roofs of these houses from the lower levels of the land to the south.

10. I consider that the proposal at No 29A would be more sympathetic to the character and appearance of the local area than the examples at Nos 25A and Nos 13 and 15. It would have a half-hipped roof which would be less prominent than a hip to gable conversion, and, whilst the dormer would be over two-thirds the width of the roof, it would be largely hidden behind the half-hip and not harmful to the visual amenities of the streetscene.
11. With regard to its impact on the wider area, the houses immediately to the south of the appeal property are well below its level, and largely screened from it by boundary planting. The only other potential views of the proposed development would be from a long-distance away across the valley to the south. The development would not be readily visible from this distance and would have no harmful impacts on the character or appearance of the area.
12. In the context of the host property itself, the significant drop in levels down the plot, together with the resultant increased angle of view of the dormer extension, would reduce the apparent bulk of the proposal from any relevant viewpoint. Moreover, the half-hipped nature of the roof design, as opposed to a hip-to-gable extension, would appear less dominant and visually intrusive in the context of both the existing property and the local streetscene. For these reasons, I do not consider that the proposal would appear as a disproportionate, dominant, visually intrusive or overbearing form of development.
13. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Cliff End, and it would not conflict with policy DM10.7 of the LP, or with the general thrust of guidance in the SPD. Accordingly, I allow this appeal.

Conditions

14. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR