



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by **R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3373165

120 Northborough Road, Norbury, Croydon, London SW16 4AZ

- 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 Miss O Gibson Best against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01372/HSE .
The development proposed is first floor rear extension and remodelling of existing ground floor extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3373166

120 Northborough Road, Norbury, Croydon, London SW16 4AZ

- 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 Miss O Gibson Best against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01875/HSE .
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer and the installation of two rooflights on front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As set out above there are 2 appeals. Although I have considered each proposal on its individual merits, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Main Issues

4. As the reason for refusal set out in the decision notices are similar, the main issue for both appeals is:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Norbury Estate Conservation Area (NECA).

Reasons

5. Northborough Road is characterised by terraced 2 storey dwellings in a traditional style that result in a pleasant residential character and appearance. As set out in the Norbury Estate Conservation Area Appraisal And Management Plan (Appraisal), the NECA is one of the earliest London County Council cottage housing estates and was built in a distinctive Edwardian cottage style. The Appraisal goes on to say that the estate has a village feel, due to the character of the architectural features present and careful breaking up of massing to reduce the visual appearance of the density of the houses. Accordingly, the significance of the NECA, insofar as it relates to the appeals, lies in the evidence of cottage-style architecture and the village feel of the area.
6. Other than the existing ground floor rear extension, the external elevations of the building are largely unaltered and retain a traditional character. Accordingly, the existing building is in keeping with the character of the NECA and contributes positively to its significance.
7. The existing ground floor rear extension would be remodelled as part of the proposal. The massing and materials of the remodelled extension would be in keeping with the existing building. In addition, the proposed rooflights on the front roofslope would not appear prominent at ground level. Therefore, these elements of the schemes would not harm the character or appearance of the NECA.

Appeal A

8. The proposed first floor extension would be sited above the rear outrigger. It would extend to the eaves of the host building and would have a flat roof. The wider terrace is largely unaltered at first floor except for a first floor extension a few properties along the terrace. The other first floor extension appears to be the only example along the terrace and given its flat roof, massing and height, detracts from the village feel of the area and architectural unity of the terrace. Whilst not directly referred to in the Appraisal, apart from this example, the rear of the properties retain a traditional character and contribute positively to the significance of the NECA.
9. The height, flat roof form and massing of the proposed first floor extension would visually dominate the host property. Therefore, it would detract from the cottage feel of the host building, harmfully eroding its traditional character and appearance.
10. While the first floor extension would not be visible from the street, it would be seen from neighbouring gardens. The proposal would add another bulky and discordant extension to the cottage-style terrace. Therefore, it would unacceptably alter the traditional character and appearance of the wider area and significance of the NECA.

Appeal B

11. The proposed dormer window would sit below the ridge line of the host building. However, it would extend across most of the width of the dwelling. Accordingly, the massing of the proposed dormer would dominate the roof of the property, detracting from its traditional character. Furthermore, the proposed windows and Juliet balcony would result in a large amount of glazing that would appear

discordant against the traditional host building and result in a top-heavy appearance.

12. The dormer window would be visible from the rear gardens of surrounding properties. As it would appear to be the only dormer window in the terrace, it would appear incongruous along the otherwise uninterrupted roofscape. As such, the proposed dormer window would diminish the traditional character of the area and significance of the NECA.
13. Although I note the examples of other dormer windows along Northborough Road, these appear to be some distance from the host building and not within the same terrace. The terrace within which the appeal site is located appears to lack dormer extensions. Therefore, these examples are not directly comparable to the appeal in terms of character and appearance.

Planning balance

14. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
15. The harm with respect to both the proposed rear first floor extension and the proposed dormer extension would be less than substantial, given the limited scale of the proposal. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
16. The Appellant has put forward a number of public benefits including the provision of the en-suite bathroom in the proposed rear extension and additional bedroom in the roof space. However, as these spaces would only be available for the occupiers of the property, they would not constitute a public benefit.
17. Even if the provision of the en-suite bathroom and additional bedroom was considered a public benefit, as the potential number of users would be limited, the benefit would be attributed limited weight. As such, this would not override the great weight that should be given to the conservation of the designated heritage assets.
18. The appellant has also indicated that the schemes would encourage continued family occupancy and long-term stewardship of the property. However, there is no substantial evidence before me to indicate that the property would be vacant in the long-term should this appeal fail. I note that there would be limited temporary economic benefits in the construction phase.
19. Overall, there are no public benefits in the terms claimed by the appellant and any benefit including securing optimum viable use that would outbalance the harm found to the significance of the NECA.
20. Consequently, the proposed first floor rear extension and dormer window would harm the character and appearance of the host building and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the NECA. Therefore, the proposals subject of Appeals A and B would conflict with Policies SP4, DM10 and DM18 of The Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy For Greater London March 2021 (London Plan)

which together seek design that is sympathetic with its local context and require development to preserve and enhance the character, appearance and setting of heritage assets within the borough, and conserve their significance.

Other Matters

21. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. As any lack of harm in this respect does not weigh in favour of the appeals, this matter has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above, the proposed developments would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR