



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/24/3352662

1579 A London Road, Norbury, Croydon, London SW16 4AA

- 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 C Jones c/o Maurice Laurent Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
- The application Ref is 24/01919/FUL.
- The development proposed is an L shaped rear loft extension with 2 rooflights in the front roof slope.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a three-storey terraced property, located on the western side of London Road, close to the junction with Acacia Road. Whilst overall roof forms in the vicinity vary, the rear roof form of the terrace containing the appeal property, maintains a pleasing uniformity and rhythm which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The outriggers all have pitched roofs and have a generally unbroken roof form with the exception of the chimneys. This is similar to the rear of terraced properties on the opposite side of Acacia Road which also front London Road, and which feature rear outriggers with pitched roofs. The roof form of the rear outrigger on the appeal property is highly visible from Acacia Road.
4. The proposal would introduce an L-shaped rear loft extension. I note there is an extant permission for a rear dormer on the main rear roof slope. However, this proposal also incorporates a flat-roof dormer on the outrigger. Whilst this element would be stepped down from the proposed flat-roof dormer on the main roof, the dormer would dominate and obscure the existing roof slope of the outrigger, with the flat roof set just below the roof ridge and with minimal set back from the eaves. Consequently, in combination with the dormer on the main roof slope, the L-shaped roof extension would appear bulky and incongruous, at odds with the prevailing roof forms in the surrounding area. It would harmfully disrupt the relative uniformity of roof forms that exist on the rear outriggers at present.

5. Moreover, because the rear outrigger is highly visible from Acacia Road, it would appear unduly prominent and obtrusive, and would not, contrary to the appellants view, have an inconsequential physical and visual presence within the public realm.
6. The retention of chimney stacks and parapet walls, the use of matching materials and alignment of joinery features and fenestration does not overcome the concerns I have regarding the overall design of the rear roof extension.
7. The front of the property would be unaltered other than for the insertion of rooflights to which the Council does not object. I have no reason to object to these features either.
8. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed L-shaped rear loft extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would thus conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). These, amongst other matters, seek high quality development, which is sympathetic to and enhances the local context and character and contributes positively to the public realm, landscape and townscape.

Other Matter

9. I acknowledge that the proposal seeks to optimise the capacity of the appeal site by increasing the residential accommodation, something that the National Planning Policy Framework encourages (the Framework). However, paragraph 139 of the Framework also seeks development that is well-designed and sets out that where this is not the case, development should be refused.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR