



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: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3368204

28 Chapman Road, Croydon CR0 3NU

- 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 & Mrs Darshit Desai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01111/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as double storey side extension and part first floor rear extension including the enlargement of the front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposed extensions would have on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling under a hipped roof, located within a planned estate of semi-detached and terraced housing. The estate comprises a limited range of house types with similar detailing, resulting in a broadly uniform character. This is reinforced by the regular spacing between dwellings, which contributes to an established and consistent street rhythm. Occupying a prominent corner plot on the outer curve of Chapman Road, the property features a side garden that splays markedly to follow the line of a surfaced footpath linking through to neighbouring streets. The property has been extended previously with a large flat-roofed single storey rear addition.
4. The proposed development comprises a wrap-around extension, including a two-storey side addition. While this element would be set back from the principal elevation and incorporate a roof of reduced height in keeping with the pitch of the original, it adopts a pronounced splay that closely follows the angled side boundary. This alignment would contrast with the straight flank wall of the original dwelling and give rise to a discordant relationship with its otherwise simple and coherent form. The rearward projection would extend to a point between the original rear wall and the rear of the existing single-storey addition, before extending partially across and above the rear elevation. This configuration would increase the visual prominence of the extension and accentuate its incongruity within the context of the host property.
5. The extension would be readily visible from both the surrounding street scene and adjacent footpath. Its form and siting would introduce architectural discordance,

sitting awkwardly within the area's generally simpler and more uniform character. By partially diminishing the openness between buildings, the proposal would disrupt the established rhythm of development, where consistent built form and deliberate spacing contribute positively to legibility and character.

6. The appellant refers to other developments nearby said to be of similar scale and approved by the Council. From the limited information available, those extensions appear to respect the form and proportions of their host dwellings, remain subordinate in scale, and broadly maintain the rhythm of the street scene. In contrast, the appeal proposal departs from these characteristics. Consequently, these cases are not directly comparable to the development before me and in any event, I have assessed this proposal on its own merits and in light of its specific context.
7. 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.
8. The Council is satisfied the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours. I have no reason to disagree with these conclusions and compliance with the development plan in these respects is a neutral factor.

Conclusion

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

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR