



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2021

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08/11/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/21/3270309

207A Coulsdon Road, Coulsdon CR5 1EL

- 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 C Nevin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/06483/FUL, dated 16 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'Rear dormer roof extension; hip to gable extension; second floor side window and two front rooflights'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. However, as the main parties have had an opportunity to comment on this matter and I am satisfied that neither party has been prejudiced in this regard.
3. Since the determination of the original application the London Plan 2021 (a Replacement Plan) has been published by the Mayor. This London Plan replaces all previous versions. Copies of the relevant new London Plan policies were submitted with the Council's comments on the revised Framework and the appellant has also had an opportunity to comment on these. Therefore, I am satisfied that they have also not been prejudiced in this regard either.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a first floor flat of a former two storey semi-detached dwelling which had been sub-divided. The appeal property, the flat below it and their neighbour, no. 209, form a pair of semi-detached two-storey properties which sit within a row of similar pairs of relatively symmetrically appearing dwellings on this part of Coulsdon Road. Most of these paired properties have hipped roofs with some having gable ends. Both the appeal property and no. 209 have hipped roofs with neither of them having any first-floor rear extensions.

6. Given its location fronting Coulsdon Road, I consider the appeal property to be in a visually prominent location within the street scene. The proposal would extend the first floor flat upwards to create an additional second floor providing two additional bedrooms, a new storage area and a new bathroom. To facilitate this, two new velux windows would be installed on the front roof slope with a box dormer extension, Juliet balcony and associated fenestrations including a glass door being installed on the rear roof slope. The roof of the property would also be converted from a hipped roof to a gable end.
7. Given the proposal's design, the size of the rear projections at first floor level and the alteration to the style of the roof, it would be visually quite different to its adjoining property and other neighbouring pairs of semi-detached properties on this part of Coulsdon Road. Consequently, and given its visually prominent location, I find that it would represent a discordant addition to the appeal property that would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the pair of buildings to which it belongs. As a result, even though the proposal would not be higher than the existing roof ridge-line and its materials would match the existing property, it would interrupt the pattern of roof forms visible from the street thereby also representing an incongruous addition to the street scene nonetheless. Consequently, it would have a significant adverse visual impact on this part of Coulsdon Road.
8. I note the appellant's point that a certificate of lawful development for a similar proposal at no. 209 has been granted. However, from what I observed on my visit this had not yet been implemented. Furthermore, whether this would be implemented or not is something which is within the appellant's control. I therefore cannot be certain that it will be implemented. Moreover, should the neighbouring dwelling be altered in a similar manner I consider it likely that it would cause a similar degree of unacceptable visual harm to the street scene for similar reasons as the proposal. As a result, I afford this consideration limited weight and it therefore does not alter, overcome, or outweigh my findings above.
9. I also note that developments like the proposal could potentially be implemented on dwellings nearby under permitted development rights. However, I cannot be certain if and when such developments would be implemented. As a result, I afford this consideration limited weight and it therefore does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policies SP4 and DM19 of the adopted Croydon Local Plan as supported by the adopted Croydon Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and policies D3 and D5 of the published London Plan. It would also conflict with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the appeal property is not located within a conservation area and that neither it nor any part of the appeal site is a listed building. However, this is not of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm I have identified above.

12. I also acknowledge that no objections have been submitted by neighbouring residents. However, even so, given the significant visual harm I have found this matter is of insufficient weight to outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would not accord with the development plan when read as a whole and the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies contained within it. Furthermore, there are no material considerations which indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
14. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR