



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2021

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3275032

13 Winchelsey Rise, South Croydon, CR2 7BP

- 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 & Mrs Cavanagh against the decision of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/00738/HSE, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of roof extensions and alterations, including front and rear dormers, raised roof ridge and mansard extension to rear, introduction of a rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's Decision Notice as this more accurately describes the elements which require planning consent. The Council's description of development is also reflected on the applicant's appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the existing building and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located along Winchelsey Rise, which forms one of a number of streets in the local area that contains formally laid out speculative housing which appears to date from the mid-twentieth century. Both sides of Winchelsey Rise contain larger detached dwellings which have a symmetry in their placement and which follow the slope of the street which falls from south to north. Whilst there is a variance in design, there is some cohesion in building elements such as hipped rooves, large chimney stacks, the use of brick detailing, and render. The dwellings maintain a similar placement of built form with front gardens, and visual gaps in between properties which give a sense of spaciousness in and around dwellings. There is evidence of small extensions along the street, including the appeal site, however these remain subservient to the dwellings.
5. The use of traditional materials such as brick, and clay roof tiles along with the similar designs reinforce an architectural integrity, uniformity and authenticity which creates a formal picturesque townscape which along with vegetated front gardens and street trees gives a leafy and distinctive character. The majority of

front roof planes along this section of Winchelsey Rise are relatively simple and functional in design and give an uncluttered and authentic form with unaltered roof planes being the dominant characteristic of the street scene.

6. The appeal site displays a number of positive qualities which are experienced within the street scene, being one of the characteristic detached dwellings and containing many of the important design elements and original roof forms which reinforce the local character and distinctiveness of the area.
7. In undertaking extensions to the rooves of buildings, the London Borough of Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy DM10 seeks to ensure that residential extensions satisfy criteria relating to the scale, height and massing, amongst others; with adherence to the Supplementary Planning Document 2 Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD). Paragraphs 2.19 and 4.21 of the SPD gives guidance with regards to roof forms, extensions and alterations where consideration is given to proportionality and massing of the extension in relation to the building and the street. In relation to roof dormers, the SPD seeks that these be located to the rear of properties or other locations where they would not negatively impact the appearance or rhythm of the street with considerations around composition, shape and size of the dormer.
8. The applicant's Statement of Case (SoC) notes that there are examples¹ along the street of dormer roof forms which in the applicant's opinion would set a precedence for the proposed development and that these are part of the inherent character of the street scene. Assessing the character and appearance of the street scene on my site visit, it was evident that considering the street as a whole, the relatively few dormer roof extensions combined with examples where roof ridges have been altered in some examples, give a haphazard, cluttered and discordant appearance within the street scene that interferes with the inherent symmetry which is a positive characteristic. I am therefore not of the same opinion as the applicant's SoC that the limited number of dormer roof extensions placed on prominent roof pitches are part of the inherent character of the locality.
9. I appreciate that the proposed front dormer window has been reduced in size from a previously refused application, however the proposed alteration has little relationship to the composition of the dwelling, and would sit awkwardly on the front plane of the roof to the detriment of the design of the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the locality.
10. In addition to the front dormer, there are also a number of alterations, such as the lifting of the ridge of a previous side extension to match the ridge of the main dwelling as well as changing the pitch of the roof at the rear along with the addition of gabled roof forms to the rear of the dwelling. The existing extension to the side is subservient to the main dwelling, however the proposals would add a large amount of increased bulk and massing to the dwelling which changes the way the existing side extension is experienced as a subservient addition. The previous side extension would be incorporated into the main element of the dwelling by the increased ridge height, with the proposed alterations to the roof form giving an overcomplicated and dominant appearance which detracts from the functional design of the building.

¹ Applicant's Statement of Case Appendix 2

11. Taken as a whole, and in conclusion of this matter, the proposed alterations and extensions would cause unacceptable detriment towards the architectural authenticity and integrity of the existing building and cause harm towards the character and appearance of the surrounding locality. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the LP Policy DM10, which is supported by the SPD, as described previously.

Other Matters

12. I note comments in the Applicant's SoC with regards to the lack of representations from neighbouring residents with regards to the proposal. The lack of objection does not mean that the development is acceptable when assessed against the policies of the development plan. I have assessed the application on its merits which has shown to be contrary to the policies of the development plan.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR