



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2023

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 JULY 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/22/3310902

First Floor Flat, 1 Osborne Road, Thornton Heath CR7 8PD

- 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 Jean-Noel Louison against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/03414/FUL, dated 9 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer window extension and 1 additional front roof light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.
3. The address of the appeal site also varies between the planning application form and subsequent documents. I have taken the address in the heading above from the Council's decision notice as this reflects the basis on which the application was considered.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached dwelling of a traditional appearance. A distinctive feature of the building and its adjoining neighbour is the use of a hipped roof and front facing gables, which give this pair of buildings a pleasing symmetry.
6. The proposal would remove the hipped roof of the building and replace it with a gable to the side. This would disrupt the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining dwelling, and would be a jarring and discordant feature in views of these buildings from the streetscape to the front of the site.
7. The rear dormer would also be a box-like addition dominating the rear roof slope. Due to the angled arrangement of the building in respect of its detached

neighbour, both the rear dormer and side gable would be readily apparent as obtrusive additions to the attractive roofscape of the appeal site.

8. A neighbouring pair of dwellings has a gable roof rather than a hipped roof design. However, even allowing for unsympathetic extensions, this neighbouring pair are of a symmetrical appearance relying on the use of gables. They do not therefore establish a principle for the use of a side gable within the context of the appeal site and its attached neighbour.
9. There are a number of extensions to properties within this area, including flat-roofed 2-storey extensions and dormer windows to the side and rear. However, dormer windows on nearby properties were not as prominent within the streetscape, and in any event the extensions I saw served to confirm the harm that can arise from unsuitable designs. This included the 2-storey flat roofed extension adjacent to the appeal site. Even within the context of the varying designs of buildings within this streetscape, the proposal would appear as an unsympathetic addition to the host building and a discordant feature in views of the area.
10. I therefore conclude that, due to its design and arrangement, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design and character requirements of Policies SP4.1, DM10.1 and DM10.7 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR