



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2024

by N Perrins BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22ND July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3342436

90 Windermere Road, Coulsdon, Surrey CR5 2JB

- 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 Darren Sherwood against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref: 24/00640/HSE.
 - The development is for hip to gable roof alterations & loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling with a hipped roof, and a cat slide roof on its front elevation that runs from the ridge of the property to first floor level. The character of the area is residential comprising a mix of mostly detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying designs.
4. The appeal proposal comprises hip to gable roof extensions on both ends of the property, which would square off the roof slope on both sides. A full width dormer would be erected on the extended rear roof slope.
5. Dwellings along Windermere road mainly have hipped roofs, although there are other designs present including those with gables on side elevations. In this case, the proposed change from hip to gable ends would maintain the existing height of the roof whilst changing its shape and adding bulk to each side. Some of the additional bulk would be set behind the cat slide roof to the front, which would help to limit its overall visual impact in the street scene.
6. I note that the appellant has highlighted examples of consented hip to gable roof extensions on other properties along the road. The examples provided for No 76 and 78 Windermere Road are particularly relevant as they demonstrate that similar hip to gable extensions to detached properties near to the appeal site have been found to be acceptable, and not harm the character and appearance of the street scene.

7. However, the proposal also includes a rear dormer that would extend almost the full width of the extended roof without any perceptible set back from the side elevations. This is in contrast to the rear dormers approved at Nos 76 and 78, which were proposed as subservient additions set back from their side elevations. When the full width dormer is considered together with the hip to gable extensions, as I must do in this case, the proposal as a whole would result in an overly large, bulky and top heavy addition to the property that is at odds with the character and appearance of the roof scape in the area.
8. I acknowledge that to the rear of the property is the railway line as opposed to neighbouring properties. Whilst the visual impact of the proposal would be limited as a result, the rear dormer by reason of its width would still appear as an incongruous and excessively large addition to the property that would harm the character of the dwelling within its individual setting.
9. The other examples provided by the appellant were for extensions to semi-detached properties, which are not directly comparable to the proposed extension to a detached house as in this case. None of the examples presented, therefore, provide any justification for the harm to the character and appearance of the area that would arise from the size, scale, bulk, and width of the appeal proposal.
10. For the aforementioned reasons, the development is contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, which amongst other things require development to respond positively to local distinctiveness, be high quality and respects and enhances Croydon's varied local character. The proposal would also conflict with Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. To conclude, the development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. There are no material considerations that would outweigh the conflict with the Development Plan and therefore the appeal is dismissed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR