



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3312715

5 Notson Road, South Norwood, Croydon, London, SE25 4JZ

- 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 Ms Valerie Howell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/02743/HSE, dated 27 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as planning application for loft conversion by raising ridge height and to have rear dormer with Juliet balcony and 3 velux windows in the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion by raising ridge height and to have rear dormer with Juliet balcony and 3 velux windows in the front roof slope at 5 Notson Road, South Norwood, Croydon, London, SE25 4JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02743/HSE, dated 27 June 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1907 01; 1907 02, 1907 03, 1907 04 and 1907 05.
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) Prior to the occupation of the extension at least one water butt of 100 litre volume shall be installed at the property and shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.
 - 5) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms Valerie Howell against the Council of the London Borough of Croydon. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, mid-terraced dwelling. The surrounding area comprises of long rows of terraced housing of a similar character and appearance although many of the properties have been altered and extended over the years.
5. The appeal proposal is for the raising of the existing ridge of the dwelling and for the erection of rear dormer. Three rooflights are also proposed on the front roof slope.
6. The Council state that the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area could not be accurately assessed due to what they consider to be discrepancies between the elevational drawings. The proposed rear elevation shows the rear dormer to be of equivalent height to the new ridge height, whilst the Council state that the side elevation shows the dormer to be set down. However, having visited the site and with the benefit of the clarification provided within the appellants statement, I am satisfied that the plans are consistent as the flank elevation shows the raised parapet wall between the dwelling and the neighbouring dwellings.
7. The Council's main concern set out in their officer report appears to be in relation to the raised ridge height. The ridge height of the existing property would be raised by about 0.25m. As stated above, the ridge line between the dwellings is broken by a parapet wall. The proposed raised roof would be contained within the raised parapet wall with the adjoining dwellings and would not be readily apparent in the street scene. There are also examples in the immediate area where the ridge height of dwellings has been raised by a similar amount to facilitate rear dormers.
8. The three 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 on the front elevation would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the immediate surrounding area.
9. The proposed rear dormer would be the same height as the raised ridge height of the dwelling and would sit just above eaves height. It would therefore be a large addition which would dominate the rear roof slope of the dwelling.
10. However, I observed at my site visit that there are several other examples of similar rear dormers in the immediate area. The proposed dormer would be visible from the adjacent Belfast Road, however it would be seen in context with other similar dormers to properties on both sides of Notson Road. Therefore, given the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the host property or the surrounding area.

11. Thus, I conclude that the proposal would comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which collectively seek to ensure a high quality built environment which respects and enhances local character.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions which I have amended slightly as necessary.
13. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. Condition 4 is imposed in the interests of sustainability and condition 5 is required to ensure fire safety.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR