



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3347480

107 Crowther Road, South Norwood, Croydon, London, SE25 5QS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Faye Rice against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/01348/HSE.
 - The development proposed is 850mm ridge raise to provide adequate headroom for a loft conversion to provide two additional bedrooms and a shower room and construction of tile clad dormers to side elevation roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 850mm ridge raise to provide adequate headroom for a loft conversion to provide two additional bedrooms and a shower room and construction of tile clad dormers to side elevation roof slopes at 107 Crowther Road, South Norwood, Croydon, London, SE25 5QS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01348/HSE, 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 approved plans: Location and Block Plan and Drg Nos P001, P002, P003, P004 and P006.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. No 107 is a two-storey end terrace within a residential neighbourhood. The north side of Crowther Road, within which No 107 sits, comprises principally terraced houses of similar age and form set behind shallow garden frontages. The appeal property is unique with a gable fronted elevation and ridge running perpendicular to the alignment of the road with a valley gutter abutting the gabled side elevation of the attached property at No 109. This arrangement contrasts markedly with all other properties which are more conventionally

orientated with ridge lines of the terraces running parallel to the road in a uniform manner.

4. The proposal is to raise the ridge height by 850mm, with a commensurate increase to the pitch of the roof, and to insert two dormer windows to the exposed side (west) elevation and one dormer window to the opposite side adjacent to No 109.
5. The Council has no objection to the raised ridge height. I have no reason to disagree. It would bring the ridge level with the ridge height of its attached neighbour and consistent with the ridge height of the adjoining terrace as it extends along Crowther Road to the west.
6. The forwardmost dormer to the west elevation and the single dormer to the east elevation would be recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation by around 3.6m. When approaching the appeal property and looking west along Crowther Road, the dormer to the east side elevation would be almost entirely screened from sight by the roof form of No 109. When approaching from the opposite direction, despite the proposed removal of one chimney stack, the forwardmost dormer would be set behind a more forward set and prominent second chimney stack, which is proposed to be raised commensurately with the ridge height. Due to this, the dormer's deeply recessed position, and the narrow separation that exists between the appeal property and its unattached neighbour at No 105, the dormer would be largely out of sight. Only parts of it would be glimpsed from very narrow and limited viewpoints along Crowther Road and at an elevated position where it would appear neither prominent nor detrimental to the gabled form or roof profile of the dwelling.
7. The rearmost second dormer to the west side elevation would be screened from sight by the first. Furthermore, all three dormers would be set up from the eaves and down from the ridge and framed appropriately by the main roof slopes on each side. I find nothing about their sizes or positions that would appear bulky, incongruous, or dominant in their setting. As such I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of No 107, or to the wider character or appearance of the street scene. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies SP4 or DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 as far as they seek to ensure that development displays a quality of design that respects local context, or with the similar requirements of Policies D3 or D4 of The London Plan 2021.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area a condition is also required to ensure that the development is finished externally in materials to match the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR