



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

**by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 15<sup>th</sup> February 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3312534**

**121 Biggin Hill, Upper Norwood, Croydon, London, SE19 3HX**

- 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 & Mrs O Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 22/02938/HSE, dated 11 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2022.
  - The development proposed is 'proposed loft extension'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, mid-terraced dwelling. The other properties that form the terrace are of a similar character and appearance.
4. The appeal proposal is for the raising of the existing ridge of the dwelling and for the erection of an 'L' shaped rear dormer. Two rooflights are also proposed on the front roof slope.
5. The ridge height of the property would be raised by about 300mm. As the terrace is located on a hill, 121 Biggin Hill sits slightly lower than the adjoining dwelling to the north, No.119. The ridge line between the dwellings is broken by a parapet wall. The proposed raised roof would not exceed the height of No 119 and would be contained within the raised parapet wall with No 123. The two rooflights proposed on the front of the roof slope are of modest scale and are of a similar appearance to the rooflights on other dwellings within the same terrace. I therefore conclude that the raised roof together with the proposed rooflights would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the immediate surrounding area.
6. The proposed rear dormer would be the same height as the raised ridge height of the dwelling. The dormer would extend down to the eaves of the main roof and of the outrigger. The dormer would also extend out to the edge of the outrigger. Overall, having regard to the size and scale and lack of

subservience, the dormer would completely dominate the roof of the existing dwelling resulting in a top heavy appearance that would be incongruous and harmful to its character and appearance. The proposed rear dormer would be highly prominent when viewed from Arkell Grove due to its proximity and as such I consider that it would also be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. I acknowledge that several other dwellings within the same terrace have dormers to their main roof and outriggers. However, the proposed rear dormer would be more prominent when viewed from Arkell Grove than these other examples. The Council also confirm that the other roof dormers to properties in the terrace are likely to have been constructed under permitted development allowances. I note the appellant's comments that a similar dormer at the appeal property could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, in my view, the visual impact and prominence of the proposed roof dormer would be further accentuated by the uplift in ridge height whereby it would be highly prominent in relation to the adjoining lower dwellings to the south.
8. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, it would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which together seek to ensure a high quality built environment which respects and enhances local character.

### **Other Matters**

9. I acknowledge that the proposal would make the efficient use of the site and would be less disturbing to the occupiers than other potential forms of extension. I also note that the appellants would benefit significantly from the additional flexible floorspace that would be created by the proposal. Whilst the appellant has also provided a photograph of a prominent rear dormer in an adjacent street, I have no further information regarding the development and place little weight on this example. Overall, none of these factors are of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm I have identified above.

### **Conclusion**

10. Accordingly, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Davis*

INSPECTOR