



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2025

by **Les Greenwood MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3353298**

**2 Old Lodge Lane, Purley, Croydon CR8 4DE**

- 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 S Damzi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref is 24/02281/HSE.
  - The development proposed is infill first floor rear extension and roof terrace above, rear roof dormer extension and installation of 4 x roof lights on the front roof slope and new front porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matters

2. The submitted roof plan indicates the installation of solar panels but these are not shown on the elevation drawings. As they are also not included in the description of the proposed development, I have not considered them as part of the appeal scheme.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024, during consideration of the appeal. Having regard to the changes in the Framework and to the comparatively minor scale and nature of this appeal proposal, I consider that further consultation on this matter is not necessary.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

5. 32 Old Lodge is a detached house sitting within a mixed commercial and residential area. The proposal would extend and convert the roof space and replace a rear roof terrace with a green roofed infill extension. The Council raises no concerns about the proposed roof lights at the front, which would fit in reasonably well with the house and the local area. The proposal also includes the replacement of the house's pebbledash render with smooth white render, which would be a visual improvement.
6. Both the rear dormer and the infill extension would, however, be high level, boxy structures that would sit awkwardly with the existing pitched roof character of the

house. The rear dormer, as high as the main roof, would be seen in some views from the street. Its metal cladding and extensive glazing would make it stand out as an unsympathetic addition to the house. The combined bulk of the 2 extensions would be seen from neighbouring properties, substantially altering the building's character and appearing to be grafted on to its more traditional design. Although the architecture in the area is varied, with other dormer windows and a flat roofed commercial building nearby, I saw nothing of similar design. I find that the proposed rear extensions would not complement the character of the house or that of the surrounding area.

7. I note that the plans also show a change from small, plain roofing tiles to 'new pantiles/slate tiles', though the application form just indicates 'slate tiles'. In contrast to the potential use of curved pantiles, the use of flat, slate-type tiles would maintain the roof's clean lines and would therefore be preferable. This matter could have been dealt with by condition if the appeal were allowed.
8. Notwithstanding the improved render, I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the house and the local area due to the proposed rear extensions. It thus conflicts with The London Plan 2021 policy D3, Croydon Local 2018 Plan policies SP4 and DM10 and the Framework, which seek high quality design that responds to the existing character of a place.
9. I note that the proposal has been reduced from an earlier scheme, to try to meet the Council's requirements. I agree with the appellant that the assessment of design in cases like this is somewhat subjective. These points do not, however, alter my assessment.
10. I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Les Greenwood*

INSPECTOR