



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by Joanna Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3367243

12 Alpine Close, Croydon, CR0 5UN

- 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 Ross Johnson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application ref is 25/01060/HSE.
 - The development proposed is for construction of rear dormer roof extension and moving front entrance door.
-

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
4. The Council appears to raise no objection to the proposed two roof lights to the front roof slope of the dwelling and repositioning of the front entrance door. I too find these elements of the proposal acceptable as the rooflights are of a modest size within the roof slope and the repositioned front door would mirror the existing arrangement. These elements would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two storey end of terrace dwelling situated within a residential area. The terraced dwellings are arranged in rows, separated by pedestrian footways and wide verges, within staggered blocks. They have a uniform character and appearance with the asymmetric roof form a distinctive feature with a shallow rear and steep front pitch. Garage blocks and car parking bays are situated at the end of the terraces separating the dwellings from the road. The side elevations and side roof profiles of the end of terrace dwellings are particularly visible from the road.

6. The roofscape of the terrace dwellings within the estate is largely preserved as originally built. There is one rear roof extension at 2 Alpine Close situated in the same block as the appeal site. This rear roof extension was constructed under permitted development and was granted a certificate of lawfulness (24/01397/LP). However, this rear roof extension is the exception to the prevailing pattern of the roofscape locally.
7. The proposed rear roof extension would appear as a substantial addition to the dwelling. It would extend almost the full width and depth of the rear roof slope and close to the ridge height of the host dwelling. Given the position of the appeal dwelling at the end of a terrace, the proposal would be highly visible from St Bernards. Whilst the proposed dormer would use a similar palette of materials to that of the host dwelling and would not extend beyond the limits of the existing rear roof slope it would nevertheless fail to assimilate well with the character and appearance of the dwelling. It would be a visually dominant and bulky addition to the dwelling and would introduce an alien feature that would disrupt the predominately unchanged roof profiles of the appeal property and its neighbours.
8. The appellant has stated that the dormers would create additional habitable accommodation and would make modest improvements to the thermal performance of the dwelling, bringing the top floor up to current Building Regulations standards. They have submitted proposed sections illustrating the head height that could be achieved. Whilst the proposal would optimise use of the roof space and improve thermal performance it does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area, and I therefore give it only limited weight in my decision.
9. The appellant has indicated that the proposed rear extension would fall just outside of 'permitted development' (PD) and therefore results in a fallback position that would make the appeal proposal acceptable. In assessing the weight that can be given to the fallback position I have to determine if there is a realistic possibility of the PD scheme coming forward. I note that there is no certificate of lawfulness, and no detailed plans/elevations of the alternatives before me relating to a PD proposal. Therefore, it is not possible to assess whether the alternatives would have a lesser, equal or greater impact on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and surrounding area. The fallback position therefore has limited weight.
10. I conclude that the proposed rear roof extension would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The fallback position and the desire to provide enlarged living accommodation and improve thermal efficiency do not clearly outweigh the harm I have identified above.
11. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and D3 of the London Plan (2021) which seek high quality design which contributes positively to and respects local character. London Plan Policy D4 does not appear to be directly relevant in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Joanna Gilbert

INSPECTOR