

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3273895

7 Bradmore Way, Coulsdon, CR5 1PF

- 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 Aaron Little against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/06397/HSE, dated 11 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations to include alterations to roof/ridge height, erection of dormer extension on front roof slope and hip-to-gable roof extension at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application form; I note the Appellant also uses this description on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a traditional detached suburban bay-fronted dwelling within an area of established residential character where homes and gardens combine to create a locality of pleasing appearance. The planned alterations are as described above.
 5. There is a mix of house types found locally. However, the appeal property lies within an unusual run of about seven homes which display almost identical elevations and roof forms and with some grace and consistency they rise logically up the contours of the street. This scene is readily observed and is attractive to the eye. None of the row has a front dormer and ridge heights appear to be original. For the appeal property to be altered in this dual way would be visually regrettable and jarring. The dormer in particular by reason of scale, form and siting would unsettle the front elevation of the appeal property
-

and would disrupt the attractive flow of currently similar homes along this stretch of road. The scheme would be very ill-at-ease visually.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Croydon's Suburban Design Guide SPD 2019 (SPD). It would also conflict with the 2021 London Plan's Policy D4: *Delivering good design* which replaces, in a similar vein, the now superseded Policies 7.4 and 7.6 cited by the Council. The forgoing policies and SPD all aim to ensure that new development is well designed and aesthetically appropriate.

Other matters

7. I do understand the Appellant's wish to extend to provide better accommodation and I am aware of the planning history on the site. I recognise that the Appellants may have two 'fall back' options with the 'permitted development' scheme (Ref 20/04242/LP) which does not raise the roof and has a front roof light or the recent planning permission (Ref 21/00953/HSE) which has no front facing principal fenestration but does raise the roof. The choice of development rests with the Appellant. I am not persuaded that the combination of the provision of a front dormer and the raising the roof is visually preferable to either option and for the reasons I have given I consider that the appeal scheme would be a step too far and would be markedly alien in the streetscene. I viewed development locally and whilst dormers can on occasion be found their situation through the style and setting of their host properties is not comparable to the case in hand. I see a continuing need for good design at the appeal property and I must deal with this appeal scheme on its own merits.
8. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. Key objectives of the document are to safeguard qualities of the built environment and the development plan policies and guidance to which I refer mirror this.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR