



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3310759

3 Fox Hill Gardens, Upper Norwood, Croydon, London SE19 2XB

- 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 Domonic and Mrs Lindsey O'Mahony against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/02131/HSE, dated 20 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the reconstruction of rear roof pitch to main house to mansard plus installation of 2 No. pitched rear roof dormers to match existing front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Although referred to in the reason for refusal, the Council has confirmed that the *Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* has been revoked.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large 2-storey Victorian semi-detached dwelling, with accommodation within the roof, situated at the head of a private cul-de-sac which forms part of a residential area included within the extensive Croydon Church Road Conservation Area. There is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. The Council's *Church Road Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document* (AMP) refers to the area being characterised by the concentration of high-quality Victorian buildings in a spacious layout with mature landscaping and generous plot sizes. The heights of the residential buildings are generally consistent throughout the Conservation Area being predominantly 2 and 3 storeys in height. Some dwellings have roof accommodation where dormer style windows are within roof slopes and this applies at the appeal property.

6. The proposed development includes altering the property's rear roof slope to create a mansard style roof which would include 2 pitched roof dormer windows. The AMP refers to large roof extensions, including dormer windows, as generally being unacceptable where they will be visible from the street. However, this would not be the case with the appeal scheme and, as such, the residential character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved.
7. Where roof extensions are in principle considered to be acceptable, the AMP's guidance state that they will be considered on the merits of their individual design but should not overly dominate the host building and should be set below the main ridge height of the roof. This approach echoes the guidance in the Council's *Conservation Area General Guidance Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) where if roof extensions are considered appropriate they must respect the architectural character of the host building and should always be subordinate to the building's size.
8. The proposed alteration to the form of the appeal property's roof would fail to respect the architectural character of the building. The form and design of the mansard style roof would be a visually dominant addition to the roof which would significantly detract from the character of the host property and unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. This has already occurred with the alterations to the roofs of 1 and 2 Fox Hill Gardens and these alterations do not provide a sound reason for allowing this appeal scheme. Further, and although of a similar design to the front dormer window, the proposed rear dormers would neither relate to nor respect the fenestration of the property's rear elevation.
9. Although the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, this matter is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm caused to the character and appearance of the host property.
10. Reference is made by the appellant to the proposed development mimicking the roof design of No. 5 but this appears to be have been its original form. Although other roof extensions were observed during the site visit and the appellant has referred to other dwellings where alterations have occurred, the detailed planning circumstances of these other schemes have not been provided. Accordingly, this appeal scheme has been assessed on its own planning circumstances.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan and Policy D3 of the London Plan which required development to be of a high quality. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR