



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 August 2021

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3273437

90 Hyde Road, South Croydon, CR2 9NQ

- 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 Oliver Stoye against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/00161/HSE, dated 14 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a "proposed first floor side extension over existing single-storey side extension. Proposed new rear dormer to existing loft room and hip to gable roof extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof in a street made up of houses originally substantially the same. Hyde Road rises to the East, and the road itself is across a steep slope, with houses on the same side as the appeal site almost a full-storey above the road-level, increasing their prominence and wider visibility.
4. Many of the houses in Hyde Road have been extended and altered, with one- and two-storey side extensions similar to that proposed in this appeal. However, despite the range and number of alterations, side dormers visible from the street, as proposed here, are not a feature of this street or immediate area.
5. As such, whilst the overall form, scale and effect of the extension is acceptable, the side dormer window would appear incongruous and notably different to the established character and appearance of the area. Despite its relatively small size against the overall scale of the proposal, I find that the dormer would harm the established rhythm and form which persists in the street despite the level of alterations over time. I do not consider that the set-back of the dormer from the front of the site, or the acceptability of the rest of the proposal offset the harm that the proposed dormer would cause to the regular rhythm, character and appearance of the area.

6. I acknowledge the approved developments at 89 and 98 Hyde Road, referred to by the appellant. They are clearly of a different character and appearance to the appeal site and its surroundings. However, to my mind, given their scale and appearance, they are obviously new and markedly different to the established character and appearance of smaller domestic properties such as the appeal site. As such, I do not find that those larger developments are as harmful to the established character and appearance as the gradual accretion of unsympathetic alterations as proposed here.
7. It is clear from their submissions that it is only the side dormer window which the Council finds unacceptable, and this is clearly reflected in their Decision Notice and my Main Issue above. Whilst I have the power to issue a split decision on an appeal, this power is discretionary, and I am not obliged to use it. I do not consider that the parts of the proposal which are acceptable are physically and functionally clearly severable from that part which is not. Nor do I consider that such a split decision would be clearly and easily defined with reference to the submitted drawings. As such I do not consider that a split decision would be appropriate in this case.
8. I therefore find that the proposed side dormer would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the requirements of Policies SP4.1, DM10.1 and DM10.7 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, and Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development features high quality design which respects the character and appearance of its surroundings, is sympathetic to its context, and emphasises the importance of roof form in achieving this. The proposal would also conflict with guidance in the Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019 which seeks to add detail to the development plan policies.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR