



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3348602

11 Berne Road, Thornton Heath, Croydon CR7 7BJ

- 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 Mr Govinden Tirvassen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/01195/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the enlargement of a garage and dual pitched roof with rooflights facing Geneva Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposed works as set out in the Planning Application Form includes information relating to an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness and the needs of the appellant. I have taken these matters into consideration in my determination of the appeal, but as they do not relate to an act of development, I have removed this information from the banner heading.
3. Since the appeal was lodged, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised. However, I am satisfied that there are no changes of any consequence for the main issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies at the corner of Berne Road and Geneva Road, in a residential area of Thornton Heath. In common with other dwellings in these streets, No. 11 is two-storey in height with a hipped roof, and the existing garage is accessed via Geneva Road. During my site visit, I noted that detached flat-roof garages are commonly found on corner plots, and their single-storey height provides a consistent and pleasant visual break within this relatively dense residential area. The appellant refers to development which has been carried out at other corner plots. There are some examples of large-scale extensions to the rear of such houses. Nevertheless, the predominant characteristic is of openness between dwellings adjacent to each other at road junctions.

6. The proposed dual pitched roof would be set back from the frontage of the proposed enlarged garage, and it would also match the projecting roof profile on No. 27 Geneva Road. Notwithstanding these design features and complementary materials to match the existing building, the proposed pitched roof would not be small in scale and such roof form above a garage is not a common feature in the area. In this instance, this additional mass above the garage would create a bulky and incongruous feature in the street scene. Although the proposal would be visible from a limited range of viewpoints, this bulky and unsympathetic roof form would appear unduly dominant in the street scene and detract from the predominant character of the host dwelling and the area.
7. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the local area. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole, and it would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirement of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the CLP. Taken together, these policies seek that new development is designed to the highest standard and is in-keeping with the existing character of the area.

Conclusion

8. The appellant has referred to the benefits of the appeal scheme. There is limited information before me regarding improved energy performance, but I acknowledge that the principle supports the appeal as does the sustainable location of the site. Nevertheless, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have found.
9. With regard to the need for additional accommodation for the family, there is limited evidence to demonstrate that the appeal scheme is the only means by which the additional accommodation needs could be met. Therefore, dismissing the appeal would not unacceptably violate the human rights of the appellant and their family, and this would be a proportionate and justifiable decision.
10. For the reasons given above this appeal should be dismissed.

O Tresa

INSPECTOR