



---

## 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/25/3368884**

**24 Stoats Nest Road, Coulsdon, Croydon CR5 2JD**

- 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 William Barry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref is 25/00630/HSE.
  - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear addition.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form but has been amended in the interests of clarity.
3. At the time of the planning application, a group of trees was present to the rear of the neighbouring property at No. 22 Stoats Nest Road, in close proximity to the site boundary. None of these trees was subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and no formal consent was required for their removal. Ground 2 of the Council's refusal notice refers to the potential impact of the development on these trees, which were considered to contribute to the character of the area. However, following the refusal of planning permission and prior to the submission of this appeal, the trees were removed. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the site as it currently exists, and I attach no weight to any contribution those unprotected trees may previously have made to the character and appearance of the area.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, with particular reference to the impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) known as the Stoats Nest Village Local Heritage Area (LHA).

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a crescent of similarly designed, evenly spaced dwellings forming part of a housing estate, recognised by the Council as a well-preserved example of modest interwar social housing, and defined within the Croydon Local Plan (2018) as a NDHA. Accordingly, I have had regard to Paragraph 216 of the Framework, which requires that when determining an application, the effect of the proposal on the significance

- of a NDHA should be taken into account, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
6. The heritage significance of the NDHA derives from its architectural and townscape qualities, including its planned geometric layout, consistent spacing between dwellings, and the rhythmic repetition of built form. While the estate as a whole exhibits these characteristics, they are especially pronounced within the crescent, where the absence of side extensions and the continued legibility of the original layout and design contribute to a strong and regular street rhythm. The distinctiveness of the street scene is enhanced by the crescent formation itself, which, in combination with the even spacing and consistent alignment of dwellings, reinforces the planned character and contributes positively to the significance of the NDHA.
  7. The proposed development would involve a two-storey side extension, stepping down to single-storey level at the rear and extending along the side boundary with the neighbouring dwelling, projecting beyond the rear elevation of the host property. Although the extension, featuring matching materials, would be set back from the front elevation and incorporate a roof of reduced height that matches the pitch of the original, it would nonetheless noticeably diminish the visual separation between the dwellings. The splayed footprint of the extension, following the angled boundary line, would accentuate both the sense of imposition and the erosion of the gap, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area, and in particular the spatial characteristics that contribute to the significance of the NDHA.
  8. The proposed side extension is intended to provide a self-contained annex for the appellant's elderly parents, enabling them to maintain independence and privacy and receive day-to-day support, while reducing reliance on publicly funded services. These personal circumstances and modest social economic benefits are a material consideration to which I attach moderate weight. However, the identified harm to the significance of the NDHA arising from the loss of visual separation and disruption to the established spatial rhythm of the crescent, is significant, and on the evidence before me, the benefits associated with meeting this personal need do not outweigh that harm.
  9. The appellant relies on a side extension at No 61 Stoats Nest Village (No 61) as a precedent. That property fronts the east side of the road, where semi-detached pairs sit closer together than in the crescent. In that context, the extension at No 61 broadly respects the existing rhythm, unlike the current proposal, which would notably erode the wider spacing between the properties. Moreover, no planning reference or approval details have been supplied for No 61, leaving me without evidence of its specific circumstances. In any event, each case must be assessed on its own merits, and it has not been demonstrated that the specific circumstance at this location is comparable to the appeal site.
  10. For the reasons given, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and, in turn, the historic significance of the Stoats Nest Village LHA, which is a NDHA. This harm would result in conflict with Policies SP4, DM10 and DM18 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, seek developments which respect local character, safeguard heritage assets, and deliver contextually appropriate, high quality design.

11. 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**

12. 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