
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025 by A Morrison

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3353869

8 Brooklyn Avenue, South Norwood, London SE25 4NL

- 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 Ms Jessica Fuller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/01090/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side extension and rear dormer following demolition of existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a hipped roof two storey dwelling which forms the end property of a short terrace. Due to its position fronting onto the main length of Brooklyn Avenue, the house, which has an attached flat roof converted garage, is particularly prominent within the street scene. The terrace benefits from a unified and balanced overall appearance, owing to a consistent palette of materials and the absence of first floor and roof extensions. Whilst a modest number of hip to gable and dormer window roof enlargements are visible within the surroundings, the terraces which comprise the area's relatively dense residential character mainly retain their original width and roof forms, including hipped ends.
5. The proposed first floor side extension above the converted garage would incorporate a gable end, with the house's existing roof also to be enlarged from a hip to gable as part of the scheme. I appreciate that the side extension would be subordinate in its scale in relation to the depth and height of the host dwelling, that matching materials would be used, and that the rear gardens of those adjacent properties to the site on Harrington Road are of a good length. However, the scale of the increase to the volume of the roof, together with the associated change to its shape, would combine to significantly alter the dwelling's current massing and

appearance. The resultant two storey width and gabled form would neither respect the design nor the proportions of the existing dwelling.

6. By unbalancing and disrupting the cohesive design of the terrace, the extension would also harm the appearance of the terrace in its entirety. Although, more widely, I observed there to be some examples of gabled roofs in the area, the predominance of original hipped roofs in the immediate vicinity of the site is such that the proposal would appear substantially at odds with the prevailing character of the locality. Furthermore, given the density of the area and the associated importance of the limited existing spacing between the terraces, the increased degree of enclosure which would arise from the development would be detrimental to the street scene.
7. Turning to the second main element of the scheme, the proposed dormer window would span across almost the full width of the dwelling's much-enlarged rear roof slope and would be only marginally set down from the new ridgelines. By virtue of its considerable dimensions, the dormer would represent a dominant feature and mass to the rear of the dwelling, occupying almost the entirety of the new roofscape. In doing so, it would result in an unsympathetic top-heavy appearance, which would pay scant regard to the existing design and appearance of the house and terrace.
8. I note that the dormer window would appear larger than others observed within the area due to its width across both the existing house and the proposed side extension. Whilst I accept that its visibility from the public realm would be restricted due to its siting at the rear, the dormer's substantial bulk would nevertheless be incongruous in the context of the prevailing character of the locality, where other existing roof enlargements are generally of a more modest scale, and where present, contained to the original width of the property.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. It would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018. Taken together, these policies set out requirements for new development to be of a high-quality design, to positively respond to existing local character and to respect development pattern, scale, massing and appearance.

Other Matters

10. I recognise that no objections have been raised to the proposed development from neighbouring occupiers or in regard to any impact on neighbouring living conditions. However, these are neutral factors in my assessment and do not weigh in support of the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR