



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/21/3279373

13 Leicester Road, Croydon CR0 6EB

- 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 Studio Twenty Three against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/00845/FUL dated 19 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the extension of the existing second floor involving the formation of a larger dormer and a new dormer on the rear outrigger and addition of two rooflights to the front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of the existing second floor involving the formation of a larger dormer and a new dormer on the rear outrigger and addition of two rooflights to the front roofslope at 13 Leicester Road, Croydon CR0 6EB in accordance with the terms of application ref: 21/00845/21 dated 3 June 2021 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) This development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: (06)001 (1:1250 Location plan); 06002-P1 (existing and proposed site plan); 07001-P1 (existing floor plans); 07002-P2 (proposed floor plans); 08001-P1 (existing elevations); 08002-P2 (proposed elevations).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a three-storey, semi-detached Victorian property which has been converted into flats. The immediately adjoining street scene comprises of similar properties but there is some variation in design and age of properties within the wider residential street including terraces.

4. The proposed extensions would all be located to the rear of the property and would provide additional floorspace for the existing studio flat on the second floor of the property. The proposed rear dormer over the existing outrigger would create a bedroom and the replacement dormer within the rear main roofslope would create an enlarged living space. The existing small bedroom and bathroom / wc would be altered to provide a larger bathroom and hall area. The proposed rooflights to the front roofslope would serve the kitchen area and the new bathroom.
5. The Council's Suburban Design Guide (2019) (SPD) recognises the need for the area to optimise residential accommodation to meet the needs of the community whilst ensuring good design and development that respects and harmonises with the character of the area. Designs do not need to necessarily replicate the host property but should be sympathetic to it. The SPD provides detailed guidance in respect of roof extensions and suggests that box dormers windows should be used where there is a need to enlarge the usable floor space within a loft or where they are more characteristic of the area. It also states that such extensions should ideally be located to the rear, be set in from the edge of the roof, be no higher than the existing roof and no more than two-thirds of its width.
6. The proposed dormers would both be 'box' shape additions with flat roofs. Given the general advice in the SPD such designs are not in themselves unacceptable. In terms of their overall size, the proposed dormer on the main rear roofslope would extend across virtually the whole width, thus exceeding the SPD guidelines in this respect. However, it would be set well below the ridge height of the main roof and whilst adding bulk to the rear of the roof, overall I consider that it would appear as a subordinate addition.
7. The proposed addition to the rear outrigger would extend significantly above its existing height. However, it would be well below the height of the main roof. The SPD does not appear to provide specific guidance in respect of additions to rear 'outriggers' and the proposal would introduce a large, flat roofed addition to the rear of the property of some bulk. However, given that it would only extend to about half the depth of the outrigger, thus retaining the end section of the original roof, I consider that it would also appear as a suitably subordinate addition. Taken together, the additions would be sympathetic to the host building and would not appear overly bulky or intrusive.
8. I noted on my site visit that none of the immediately adjoining properties to the rear of the appeal site had similar roof additions, those that I could see being of smaller scale. However, the appellant has referred to a number of properties in the area where it is suggested that similar extensions have been built. Whilst some of these relate to terraced properties which are not readily visible and to which different SPD advice applies, I noted that there are large rear box dormer extensions to properties that are clearly visible from the end of Leicester Road, just to the north east of the appeal site. Such additions are therefore part of the established character of the area.
9. Furthermore, the roof additions would enable the standard of the residential unit on the second floor which currently provides only a sub-standard sized studio unit to be considerably improved to provide a one bed unit.
10. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. There would be

no conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which seek to ensure that development, whilst optimising the capacity of sites, provides a high quality built environment which ensures, amongst other things, that the design of roof form positively contributes to the character of the local area and is sympathetic to local context. Overall, the proposal would satisfy the aims of the SPD.

11. In addition to a condition to relate to the approved plans in the interest of proper planning, a condition to ensure that the proposed additions are constructed using matching materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity.
12. Overall, therefore, for the reasons set out, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR