



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: 23rd January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3306756

17 Dickenson's Lane, South Norwood, Croydon, London SE25 5HJ

- 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 Paul Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/01809/HSE, dated 30 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor rear infill extension, ground floor alterations, erection of hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer, front garden alterations and provision of refuse and recycling store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. For reasons of clarity, the description of the proposed development has been adopted from the appeal form.
3. Although referred to in the reason for refusal, the Council has confirmed that the *Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* has been revoked.
4. Reference is made by the appellant to the procedural approach adopted by the Council in determining the application. However, it is not part of this appeal to consider this procedural approach but, instead, to assess the planning circumstances of the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a modest sized 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated within a primarily residential area. Within the surrounding area there are a mix of dwelling types and sizes. Some of these dwellings have been altered, including extensions projecting from their rear roof slopes. These rear roof extensions are not particularly visible from the surrounding roads with only their side elevations generally being noticeable, such as at 24 Dickenson's Lane. Alterations have occurred to the rear of 18 Dickenson's Lane which is

the other dwelling making up the pair of semi-detached dwellings that includes the property.

7. The proposed development includes the erection of a first floor extension which is not the subject of a specific objection from the Council. Indeed, this element of the appeal scheme would reflect the extension to the rear of No. 18 and, as such, there are no reasons to adopt a different assessment from the Council's.
8. The proposed development also includes an extension to the roof which would result in a change from a hipped to a gable roof form which would be noticeable from Dickenson's Lane. There would be an unbalancing of the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings when viewed from Dickenson's Lane. In addition to the change in the roof form, a dormer extension would be erected within the rear roof slope. This dormer would appear a large box like addition to the roof when viewed from both the neighbouring gardens and Dickenson's Place.
9. By reason of its design and scale, in combination the alterations to the roof form and the erection of the dormer would not appear as subordinate additions but would physically and visually dominate the rear of the property. Further, and for the same reasons, these elements of the appeal scheme would cumulatively fail to respect the size, character and appearance of this modest sized property.
10. Although the claims of the appellant about the family need for the additional accommodation and the proposed development being an effective use of the property have been noted, these matters are not sufficient reasons to outweigh the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
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 the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policies DM10 and SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan and Policy D4 of the London Plan. These policies seek high quality development that, amongst other matters, respects the appearance and built features of the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR