



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by **P H Wallace BSc (Hons) DipMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3365231

23 Abbots Lane, Kenley, Croydon CR8 5JB

- 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 Jonathan Squire against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/03581/HSE.
 - The development proposed is erection of a replacement front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a replacement front dormer at 23 Abbots Lane, Kenley, Croydon CR8 5JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03581/HSE, and the plans and details submitted with it, 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 following plans: location plan dated 20/10/24; site plan 0004/2024; existing elevations 0001/2024; existing plans 0002/2024; proposed elevations 0004/2024 Rev A; and proposed layout 0005/2004.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was originally described as, *"Replace existing dormer roof due to poor condition and water ingress and life expired window components. Increase height of dormer during re-build to give improved ceiling height of room below. Reconstruct dormer window including replacement of cladding side and flat roof covering and side window to achieve current Building Regulation compliance"*. The Council modified this to *"Erection of a replacement front dormer"* which more concisely describes the proposal. I have adopted this description as set out in the banner heading and have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The appellants' appeal statement includes 3D model images of the proposed development that were not submitted with the original planning application. I am satisfied that these do not introduce new information but merely illustrate the proposal as shown on the submitted plans. Their inclusion does not cause procedural unfairness or prejudice to any party, and I have therefore taken them into account.

4. At the time of my site visit, I observed that works had commenced on site, including the removal of the original dormer and the initial construction of its replacement. These works do not alter the substance of the appeal proposal however, and I have therefore determined the appeal based on the submitted plans and documents, rather than the partially completed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling with a gabled roof slope facing Abbots Lane which has eaves at two distinct levels. It features a single-storey front element beneath a shallow, asymmetrical roof, set below the eaves and running perpendicular to the principal roof slope. A modest, flat-roofed dormer projects from the asymmetrical roof, with its height aligning with the lower eaves of the main roof.
7. The site is located within a low density residential area having a sylvan character. While the wider surroundings contain a variety of building types, the appeal property and nearby dwellings along the same side of Abbots Lane share a consistent feature in presenting a simple, uninterrupted front roof slope.
8. A defining feature of the locality is the variation in land levels. Properties along the eastern side of Abbots Lane, including the appeal property, are set well below road level. Together with mature tree cover and established boundary screening, this results in several dwellings being either entirely obscured or visible only in part, with views typically limited to their roofscape. The appeal property is positioned close to a high retaining wall, which is topped by a timber-faced boundary screen. As a result, the building is visible only from above the lower eaves line, with the single-storey element and its dormer concealed from external view. Two detached flat-roofed garages, one serving a neighbouring property, are positioned at road level and restrict some oblique views toward the roof.
9. The proposal involves replacing the existing dormer with a larger structure extending across nearly the full width of the single-storey element. It would project a similar distance to the existing dormer and rise beneath a shallow pitched roof that integrates with the main roof, reaching the level of its upper eaves. The resulting form would sit above both the ridge of the single-storey element and the lower eaves of the main roof.
10. The upward projection of the proposed dormer above the single-storey ridge and lower eaves line would result in some disruption to the original roof form. It would also introduce a bulkier form that would reduce the sense of subordination typically expected of a dormer addition. However, this impact would be largely confined to very limited private views from within the site.
11. There would be a degree of visual discordance with the single-storey element, but from the street the development would not be seen in direct relation to the roof beneath. Instead, the dormer would project only modestly above the boundary screening and appear as a minor addition in the context of the main roof, broadly aligning with the upper eaves line. Within this setting, the development would not

appear dominant or intrusive, nor would it unduly interrupt the perception of the principal roof form. As such, it would integrate acceptably with the prevailing character of development in the area.

12. Accordingly, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and therefore accords with Policies SP4.1, DM10.1 and DM10.7 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, seek developments which respect local character and provide contextually appropriate design.

Other Matters

13. UK Power Networks refers to a substation close by and indicate that proposed works within 6m of this are notifiable under the Party Wall etc Act 1996, but this is a civil rather than a planning matter.

Conditions

14. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council with the exception of the requirement for matching materials which is unnecessary as the materials are specified on the plans and have not attracted any specific objection. The Council has also sought a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of a 'Reasonable Exception Statement'. However, I have not been provided with a copy of this document, nor is it clear whether it is publicly accessible. Without sight of the document, I cannot be satisfied that the condition meets the tests of precision and reasonableness. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out following the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR