



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

### Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3368518

### 110 Devonshire Way, Croydon CR0 8BS

- 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 and Mrs Kuci against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref is 25/00863/HSE.
  - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side and rear extensions, single storey front, side and rear extensions, and loft conversion including the erection of roof extensions, increased ridge height, two dormers to the rear roofslope and insertion of four rooflights to the front roofslope.
- 

### 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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Number 110 Devonshire Way is a modest two storey detached residential property, located on a residential street of similar styled properties. Its small tile covered hipped roof, double height front rounded bay windows, and mix of painted render and feature brickwork external walls are shared qualities with the surrounding residential dwellings, which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst I recognise varied dwelling types and patterns, they are tied together by the shared characteristics. I acknowledge some extensions and alterations in the area; however, they do not detract from the distinct local character of the area.
5. The proposal to raise the ridge and construct a crown roof and hip to half hip conversion with rear roof dormer extensions would increase the size, mass and scale of the roof and fail to respect local distinctiveness. Whilst the ridge would visually be of a similar height to neighbouring properties, the significant increase in mass and scale of the roof would dominate the host dwelling. Furthermore, the half hip with crown roof would detract attention away from the pleasant repetition of

hipped roofs in the area and would introduce an uncharacteristic roof form to an area where there is a clear and pleasant emphasis on hipped roofs with terminating ridges. Whilst there are some examples of hipped roofs with flat top elements in the vicinity, these are small, subservient roof elements that exist alongside a larger hipped element. They are also limited in occurrence. As such I differentiate these elements to the subject appeal proposal and afford them little weight.

6. I note that Nos 83, 91 and 97 are double storey detached dwellings, in proximity, which have hipped roofs with a cat slide feature element to the front elevation. The cat slide feature is a characteristic that is not shared with the appeal proposal, and I do not consider these properties to have half hip roofs or gable flanks. Therefore, I afford their existence little weight.
7. I have been referred to several other properties in the vicinity with hip to gable conversions and rear roof extensions; however, I have not been provided with any substantive detail of those developments. Therefore, I cannot be certain of the main issues in those applications, against which development plan policies those developments were considered, or if they have permission at all. None of the examples display the same characteristics as the proposed development or the appeal property and its surroundings. As such, I afford them little weight.
8. The proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), insofar as they seek high quality design that is subservient to the host building and respects the scale, height, massing, appearance and distinctiveness of the surrounding area, amongst other things.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*S Wilson*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

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

*A M Nilsson*

INSPECTOR