



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021

by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3277975

15 Brafferton Road, Croydon CR0 1AD

- 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 Rashad Bhatti against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/01395/HSE, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development is described in the application form as 'conversion of loft space and construction of L-shaped dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The roof extension has been constructed and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - i. the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - ii. the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to overbearing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No 15 is a mid-terraced house in a street of similarly sized properties. The rear of the appeal property, as with many of its neighbours, has an historic two-storey outrigger. It is over both the main rear roof slope and the full length of the outrigger that the loft extension sits.
5. The prevailing character of the rear roofslopes in the surrounding area is one which is largely unaltered. The original form and alignment of properties results in a clear sense of harmony and order. I was unable to identify any other properties within the immediate vicinity benefitting from roof extensions, partially or fully, over the rear outrigger. I noted on my site visit that the development forms the first of its kind in this part of Brafferton Road and can be glimpsed through gaps between properties along Tanfield Road.

6. The dormer extension over the main rear roof slope is large but is not unusual in its design or form and is set back from the eaves, providing some visual relief. Consequently, this element of the scheme is acceptable.
7. Nevertheless, turning to the extension over the outrigger, its length, height and prominence forms a dominant and incongruous feature on this part of the property which is at odds with the prevailing character of the street and surrounding area. The extension to the outrigger is widely visible, including from public and multiple private vantage points.
8. For the above reasons, I consider the proposals to harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, conflicting with the relevant provisions of policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (adopted 2018) and the Council's Suburban Design Guide (adopted 2019), which in summary seek to ensure high quality developments which respect and enhance Croydon's local character.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

9. The full length roof extension has introduced significant bulk to the previously mono-pitched roof and hierarchically subservient outrigger. It rises well beyond the height of rear facing windows at neighbouring No 17 in close proximity. Although there are other windows at No 17, nevertheless the scheme would be markedly out of keeping with the prevailing form and relationship of the built environment here, resulting in an increased and unacceptable sense of enclosure.
10. It is my view that this element of the proposal creates an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development that conflicts with the relevant provisions of policies DM10.6 and SP4.2 of Croydon Local Plan (adopted 2018), Policy D3 of the London Plan (adopted 2021) and the Council's Suburban Design Guide (adopted 2019), which in summary seek to ensure that the amenity of occupiers of adjoining buildings are protected.

Other Matters

11. I appreciate that a Certificate of Lawful Development (CLD) exists on the site, approved under Ref 17/05217/LP, for which I have been provided with the approved plans. However, the current proposal is significantly larger than this, projecting into the full length of the outrigger, compared with around halfway within the CLD, reaching a greater overall height and having no setback from the eaves. The current proposal therefore introduces significantly more bulk and scale to the outrigger, as outlined above.
12. I appreciate the attempts that the appellant has made to minimise the visual impact of the extension through the reintroduction of the pitched bargeboard to the rear elevation. However, this does not overcome the harm identified above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Price INSPECTOR