



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: 7th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3312476

27 Amberley Grove, Croydon, CR0 6ND

- 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 Mrs Melanie Couzins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/03453/HSE, dated 16 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is alterations, erection of hip to gable and L-shaped rear dormer extensions and provision of 2 rooflights in front roofslope and second floor window in side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of development in the banner heading as it more fully describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, end-of terrace dwelling located within a predominantly residential area.
5. The proposed development would involve a hip to gable extension which the Council oppose. I acknowledge that the end-of terrace dwelling opposite the appeal site and Nos 46 and 48 Morland Road to the north west of the site display hipped roof forms,. However, there are also other examples along Amberley Grove of gabled ends to the rows of terraces. In particular, I note that 14 Amberley Grove which is the opposing end of the host terrace has a gable end and there are other examples at Nos 11 and 13 Amberley Grove.
6. I also note that several of the dwellings along Morland Road close to the appeal site have prominent side gables. I am therefore not convinced that hipped roofs are a strong defining feature of the surrounding area. Moreover, I consider that the proposed rendered finish would match the appearance of the host property and would be acceptable in appearance. I therefore find that the

- hip to gable extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or surrounding area.
7. The proposed dormer to the main roof would be large, with no significant set back from either the ridge or the eaves of the host dwelling. It would extend across much of the width of the roof with only a slight set-in from the side elevation. Whilst the part of the dormer above the outrigger would be slightly lower than the dormer on the main roof, it would extend across almost the full depth of the outrigger and would also tower above its existing ridge line. The proposed dormer extensions would not appear subservient and would dominate the entire roof of the dwelling. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be dominant and incongruous in appearance and harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
 8. The side elevation of the existing dwelling is clearly visible from Amberley Grove. Views of the proposed roof dormers would be obtainable from the western side of Amberley Grove due to the gap between the rear elevation of 48 Morland Road and the flank elevation of the existing dwelling. Whilst at certain times of the year views would be more filtered when adjacent trees are in full foliage, the proposed dormer extensions would still be clearly visible. Views would also be obtainable from the access to the side and rear which leads three further dwellings. In my view, the dormers would appear as highly dominant additions to the existing dwelling which due to their incongruous design and appearance would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 9. The appellant has highlighted other examples in the local area of 'L' shaped dormer extensions. Of these the most relevant is at 4 Amberley Grove although the Council state that there are no planning records relating to this extension. Furthermore, in my view the rear elevation of No 4 is not as visible in the street scene as the appeal proposal. The other examples are further away and as such are less relevant as they do not form part of the immediate context of the appeal site.
 10. I also acknowledge the various examples of certificates of lawfulness that have been issued for rear dormers and to the appeal decisions in Croydon and other London Boroughs. I do not dispute that in some cases similar extensions can be built under permitted development rights and that there are examples of rear dormers and 'L' shaped dormers having been allowed at appeal. However, I have determined the appeal on the individual merits of the case, having regard to the character and appearance of the host property, the surrounding area and the prominence of the proposed roof extensions.
 11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. Thus, it would be contrary to Policies D3 and D4 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 and distinctiveness.

Conclusion

12. 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