



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3366896

12 Wisborough Road, South Croydon CR2 0DR

- 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 Murdoch against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01109/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as hip to gable roof alterations and new front gable, roof lights and rear dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was submitted in the name of 'Mr Murdoch' and the appeal by 'Mr David Murdoch-Gates'. Based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied this is the same individual. However, in the absence of any indication from the local planning authority that the application name was incorrect, I have considered the appeal based on the original submission, as reflected in the banner heading.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached two-storey dwelling set beneath a hipped roof, positioned back from and fronting the north side of Wisborough Road. Properties on this side sit at a lower level relative to the road than those opposite. The street scene is defined by a regular rhythm of evenly spaced detached dwellings, which exhibit varied architectural detailing while maintaining a broadly consistent scale and form. Front-facing roof extensions are uncommon but, where present, appear modest in scale and/or respect the prevailing character of the host dwelling. Generous rear garden depths, combined with mature tree screening, ensure that the rear elevations of properties fronting this part of Wisborough Road are not readily visible from surrounding areas.
5. The proposed development would involve the formation of gable ends to the existing hipped roof, together with the addition of a rear-facing dormer. The dormer would extend across the majority of the new rear roof slope, positioned just below the ridge line and inset slightly from both the gable ends and the rear elevation. The

Council raise concerns that the dormer would appear bulky, incongruous and visually dominant within the roofscape. However, given the property's set-back position and the limited visibility of the rear elevation, I consider that the dormer would not be readily perceived from public viewpoints and would therefore not appear as an unduly prominent or inappropriate addition.

6. However, the proposed front gable would incorporate a single large window with a mid-level horizontal glazing bar. Its proportions would be at odds with the established fenestration rhythm, appearing as an assertive feature. Coupled with the shallow set-down below the eaves, the design would fail to fully visually integrate with the principal elevation and would read as an ill-defined and intrusive addition. Its central siting would further amplify its prominence, drawing attention to its incongruity and compounding its disruptive impact on the composition of the front elevation. This would be readily perceived within the street scene.
7. The appellant refers to several local permissions for front roof extensions, including two gable designs considered to set a precedent. One, at 29 Wisborough Road, lies directly opposite the appeal site. In both cases, the designs incorporate full-height gables spanning broadly equal proportions of the first floor and roof slope. Bespoke window detailing, including leaded glass or similar, defines the gables as contributing features within the elevation, while maintaining a relationship with the established fenestration. Their off-set siting contributes to a degree of subtlety, allowing them to read as coherent forms that visually unify the front elevation and support a consistent design approach. Overall, I consider these schemes, and those involving dormer windows, to be clearly distinguishable from the appeal development. Each case must be assessed on its own merits, and I am satisfied the circumstances applying to the cases cited are materially different to the current proposal.
8. For the reasons given, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. Consequently, in this regard, it would conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, seek developments which respect local character and provide contextually appropriate design.
9. The Council is satisfied the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours and, subject to relevant planning conditions, could be made acceptable relative to fire safety and flood risk considerations. I have no reason to disagree with these conclusions, and compliance with the development plan in these respects is a neutral factor.

Conclusion

10. I conclude the proposal would conflict with the development plan, and the material considerations do not indicate the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR