



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3371454

47A Foxearth Road, South Croydon CR2 8EL

- 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 Dr Jinlong Li of Decent Property Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01854/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “demolition of existing garage and rear conservatory, erection of single/two storey side/rear extension including porch and remodelling of the back garden”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A Lawful Development Certificate was granted in June 2025 for the erection of a hip-to-gable enlargement and rear dormer extension together with three roof lights to the front roof. I observed on site that these works have not yet commenced.
3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises demolition of existing garage and rear conservatory; erection of hip-to-gable enlargement and rear dormer extension together with three roof lights to front roof slope in connection with conversion of resultant roof space to habitable accommodation; erection of single/two storey side/rear extension including porch and remodelling of the back garden. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a residential area which includes a mix of semi-detached, detached and terraced dwellings. Several dwellings have been altered from their original form, including through side extensions and roof conversions. Nevertheless, the immediately surrounding properties broadly retain their original character.
6. The development proposed, which includes a hip-to-gable enlargement and rear dormer extension over the main roof of the house, would result in the substantial

- expansion of the existing dwelling. It would be significantly larger than its semi-detached neighbour, unbalancing the symmetry of the pair of dwellings.
7. Moreover, the proposed hipped roof over the two-storey side extension would appear at odds with the proposed gable roof form of the main property. Overall, the roof form would appear contrived. Consequently, it would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the appeal property, as well as on its symmetry with No 47. It would result in the appeal property appearing incongruous in the street scene.
 8. It has been put to me that the hipped roof of the two-storey extension would improve the balance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings when the hip-to-gable enlargement is taken into account. While this would go some way to mirror the hipped roof of No 47, this would not be overly apparent from the street or overcome the resultant unbalancing of the pair of properties.
 9. The appellant has identified several examples of extensions in the local area which are suggested to be of a comparable nature. I have not been provided with full details of these cases and, in any event, each proposal must be determined on its own individual circumstances. Nonetheless, I observed on site that extensions in the immediate vicinity of the site, such as at No 50, generally reflect the roof design of the original building. Where extensions result in a combination of gable and hipped roofs these do not form a dominant feature of the surrounding area. As such, they would not support the case for the harmful appeal proposal.
 10. I acknowledge that the set back of the first floor of the side extension would result in the side extension appearing subservient to the existing dwelling. I also accept the lack of dispute between the Council and appellant in respect of the single-storey elements of the scheme. However, this would not overcome the harm identified above.
 11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it would fail to comply with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies SP4 and DM10 of The Croydon Local Plan 2018. Among other matters, these policies seek development which respects the character, appearance and existing materials of the surrounding area and retains original architectural features that contribute to the architectural character of a building.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that the appellant intends to bring a vacant property back into use. Notwithstanding the benefits associated within bringing the property back into use, this would not outweigh the harm identified above. I also acknowledge that the property is not listed and does not fall within a conservation area or the Green Belt. Be that as it may, there is no dispute in these respects, and that has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.
13. My attention has been drawn to the consented hip-to-gable enlargement and rear dormer extension at the property, with evidence of a Lawful Development Certificate under reference 25/01232/LP. This is also annotated on the submitted drawings. However, that permitted scheme does not include several aspects of the appeal scheme, including the proposed single and two storey extensions. Given

that the permitted scheme would not wholly achieve the desired outcome of the appellant, I cannot be certain that there is any greater than a theoretical possibility that the extant scheme would be implemented. More importantly, having regard to my reasoning above, in omitting the proposed extensions, the permitted scheme would be less harmful than the proposal before me. Therefore, it does not justify allowing the appeal. In this respect, I attach only limited weight to the permitted scheme as a fallback position.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt
INSPECTOR