



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3374160

17 Springfield Road, Thornton Heath, Croydon CR7 8DZ

- 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 Karol Wenda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01937/HSE.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of two storey side/rear/front wraparound extension, one dormer roof extension in rear roof slope and installation of 3 rooflights into the front roof slope. Alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling that is located on the eastern side of Springfield Road. The dwelling, and the attached 19 Springfield Road, form a well-balanced pair of properties. Their matching hipped roofs and symmetrical proportions at upper levels create a pleasing uniformity that is readily appreciated in public views, including the view experienced from Maryland Road to the west.
4. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and is largely defined by pairs of semi-detached properties of similar age and form, albeit with some variation in detailing. While the area contains dwellings that have been altered over time, including two storey side extensions, front extensions and roof extensions, the unifying characteristic along this section of Springfield Road is the consistent retention of hipped roofs, even where other alterations have occurred. These roofs create a strong rhythm and visual continuity and make a positive contribution to the established character and appearance of the locality.
5. The proposal comprises several components: a hip-to-gable roof extension, a two-storey side extension, a rear dormer, rooflights to the principal roof slope, a front extension and a single-storey rear extension.

6. I acknowledge that when considered individually, the front extension and single-storey rear addition would not appear excessive or harmful to local character or appearance. However, the overall assessment cannot be disaggregated, as the principal roof alterations and two-storey extension would be perceived together as one enlarged form. The cumulative impact is materially greater than any individual element and must be considered as such within the context of the site.
7. The proposed hip-to-gable enlargement would fundamentally alter the established roof form of the dwelling. It would introduce a markedly bulkier and visually dominant addition that would disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. This loss of balance would be clearly perceptible in public views both along Springfield Road and from Maryland Road. As a result, the extension would fail to be subordinate and appear incongruous and over-dominant, eroding the generally consistent pattern and rhythm of hipped roofs along this stretch of the street.
8. Although the two-storey side extension incorporates a degree of set-back from the front elevation and from the extended main roof ridge, its gable-end form, when read together with the hip-to-gable extension, would amplify the impression of mass and further disrupt the established proportions and symmetry of the semi-detached pair.
9. The proposed rear dormer, spanning both the main roof slope and the roof of the two-storey extension, would constitute a large, awkward and visually intrusive feature. Its excessive width, height and massing would overwhelm the rear roofscape and diminish the architectural integrity of the host dwelling. Although not visible from public viewpoints, the dormer would be clearly apparent from neighbouring dwellings and gardens. Despite the existence of other dormers in the vicinity, the scale and dominance of the proposed dormer would be overbearing, resulting in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.
10. The appellant cites previous planning permissions at the site. However, based on the information before me, none of these would have resulted in the combined massing now proposed. Those previous permissions were materially more restrained and preserved the key characteristic of the dwelling's hipped roof form. I consider the cumulative effect of the appeal proposal to be harmful.
11. I have had regard to the appeal decisions referenced by the appellant. However, each case must be determined on its own merits. In this instance there are clear differences, including the scale and extent of development¹ and in one case² the prominence of the site within public viewpoints, such that those decisions do not justify permitting a proposal which I have found would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. The appellant has also referred to a number of permissions for similar extensions within the wider area. However, it has not been demonstrated that these schemes are directly comparable in terms of their planning history, visibility in public views, or their relationship to a semi-detached pair or the immediate row of neighbouring dwellings. While I acknowledge that similar developments exist elsewhere along the street, the relevant context in this case is the established character of the paired dwellings and their immediate neighbours. I am therefore not persuaded that

¹ APP/L5240/W/18/3219439 and APP/L5240/D/22/3302523.

² APP/L5240/C/23/3317908.

the cited examples warrant a departure from adopted policy or outweigh the harm identified. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own planning merits.

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Policies D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018), which require high-quality design that responds positively to local character.

Other matters

14. I acknowledge the objectives in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) relating to the efficient use of land, increasing housing supply and supporting sustainable forms of development, as well as the appellant's contention that the proposal would create a more energy-efficient dwelling. However, because this is a modest householder proposal, the benefits arising from these factors are limited. They do not, in my view, outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.
15. The appellant refers to proposed dormer and hip-to-gable extensions as being permitted under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. The evidence before me is insufficient to demonstrate what form or extent of development would fall within under permitted development as defined by the Order or that there is an intention to pursue this. I am not persuaded that the suggested fall back scheme would lead to a greater, or similar level of harm, as the appeal proposals. Consequently, I attach limited weight to the fall back scheme. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own individual merits.
16. The Appellant makes reference to the Supplementary Planning Document 2 Suburban Design Guide. This document was revoked by the Council in 2022 and therefore has not been determinative in this appeal decision.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight, including the Framework, to indicate that the proposed development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR