

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3287170

9 Shirley Church Road, Croydon, CR0 5EF

- 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 Alvaro Gomes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/04027/HSE, dated 27 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'side extension, loft conversion and all associated work'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3287177

9 Shirley Church Road, Croydon, CR0 5EF

- 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 Alvaro Gomes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/04594/HSE, dated 25 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'loft conversion and all associated work'.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3287170

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3287177

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a bungalow that lies in a row of similar properties on the south side of Shirley Church Road. The general form and design of the bungalows provide a consistent appearance to this part of the road, which is a positive feature to the road.
-

5. The proposed works in Appeal A would see, on the western side of the property, the existing front side gable raised and then, behind that, the second gable removed and a flat roofed dormer. The raising of the front gable would provide some screening of the dormer addition, but I saw at my site visit there would still be very clear views when looking along the road from the west. In those views the depth and width of the dormer would appear of an excessive scale, being obtrusive and out of character with the area. That unwelcome visual effect would be emphasized by the flat roof design that is at odds with the property and the wider area.
6. The Council's Suburban Design Guide 2019 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance for extensions to roofs and seeks to ensure that, in the case of side roof extensions, they should not interrupt the appearance of the roof when viewed from the street. The scale and design of the proposed dormer on the western elevation would not satisfy these objectives.
7. An extension to the existing dormer on the eastern elevation is proposed. which would be a modest change appropriate to the bungalow and the area. However, it is the dormer to the western side that represents harm to the character and appearance of the area, and hence conflicts with the SPD and Policies DM10.1 and DM10.7 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, the general thrust of which is to seek to ensure a high-quality built environment and that new development is of a high standard of design.
8. The proposed works in Appeal B would see the removal of two gables on the western side of the property and erection of a large dormer window with shallow pitched roof. This would significantly alter the appearance of the building due to the siting, scale and design of the addition: those features would bear little resemblance to the design and form of the existing bungalow. There would be extensive views of the dormer from the front and side of the property, which would be disruptive to the generally consistent street scene of this side of the road.
9. The SPD guidance for side roof extensions further states that they should be no more than two thirds the width of the existing roof, in addition to not interrupting the appearance of the roof when viewed from the street. The scale and design of the proposed dormer would not conflict with these objectives.
10. Again, the small extension to the eastern dormer would be appropriate. However, the visual intrusion from the western dormer is of a degree sufficient to conflict with the SPD and development plan policies referred to earlier.
11. I recognize the appellant's wish to provide additional accommodation at the property, and that the design and siting of the extensions in both appeals have sought to ensure no harm to the living conditions of adjoining residents. I also note the changes in the wider area, including the development of flats at the junction of Shirley Church Road and Upper Shirley Road. However, the works in both schemes show changes that would not relate well to the host property or the row of consistent bungalows, and my conclusions remain that the proposals would be contrary to the development plan when considered as a whole. The appeals are therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR