



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

By SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/25/3368341

Brooklyn, 12 Uplands Road, Kenley, Croydon CR8 5EF

- 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 Mrs Sharon Godfrey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01105/HSE.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, extended first floor and extended frontage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, extended first floor and extended frontage at Brooklyn, 12 Uplands Road, Kenley, Croydon CR8 5EF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/01105/HSE subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 12UR/Planning/01, 12UR/Planning/02, 12UR/Planning/06, 12UR/Planning/07, 12UR/Planning/08, 12UR/Planning09A, 12UR/Planning10A, 12UR/Planning/11; Fire Strategy.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The roof area of the extensions hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area and shall only be accessed for repair, maintenance or for emergency access/egress.
 - 5) At least one water butt of 100 litre volume shall be installed on a downpipe attached to the roof of the property prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter retained and maintained.

Preliminary Matter

2. During the appeal process, revised drawings were submitted by the appellant. However, I am not satisfied that the amended plans are sufficiently clear or complete to form the basis of my assessment. Accordingly, I have determined the

appeal solely on the basis of the originally submitted plans, which are those assessed by the Council and listed on the Council's Decision Notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached two-storey dwelling located within an established residential area. The street scene is characterised by substantial detached dwellings of varied architectural styles and scale, with no single, uniform built form. Notwithstanding this diversity, the prevailing character of the area is defined by large plots, generous setbacks from the highway, and mature landscaping within front gardens, which together create a spacious and verdant character.
5. The appeal dwelling occupies a sizeable plot and is set well back from the highway behind a landscaped frontage, reflecting these prevailing characteristics. The principal elevation displays an asymmetrical composition, with a prominent catslide roof, which contributes positively to the varied character of the street. The relationship between the main dwelling and the garage, linked by a flat-roofed element, results in an imbalanced and visually disjointed appearance to the elevation at lower levels.
6. The proposal comprises a combination of single-storey and first-floor extensions to the front, side and rear of the dwelling. The gable elevation would be extended to meet a new catslide roof, while the wider first-floor extension would replace the existing side dormer and be positioned above the garage and extended ground-floor accommodation. This element would be deliberately set back from the extended principal elevation.
7. The dwelling's asymmetrical form would remain a key characteristic of the design, with a catslide roof a defining and prominent feature of the front elevation. The set-back of the first-floor side extension would ensure that the additional built form appears visually recessive and subordinate to the extended main elevation. As a result, the extensions would not appear dominant or top-heavy when viewed from the public realm, instead reading as secondary elements within a balanced overall form. At ground floor level the front extension would provide an improved balance and consistency to the elevation.
8. I acknowledge that the proposal would result in a noticeable change to the appearance of the dwelling. However, change in itself does not equate to harm. The resulting form would remain balanced, proportionate, and coherent. While the proposal would increase the overall footprint, length and mass of the dwelling, this must be assessed in its context. The surrounding area displays a wide range of dwelling sizes and proportions, including elongated properties and dwellings that have been significantly extended or redeveloped. In this context, the proposal would not appear incongruous or excessive.
9. Given the varied street scene, the dwelling's recessed siting, and the presence of established landscaping, public views of the proposal would be largely oblique and filtered. In these circumstances, the development would not appear unduly

prominent, would not disrupt the rhythm or openness of the street, and would sit comfortably within the established pattern of development.

10. The Council raises concern regarding the use of zinc cladding on the first-floor side extension. However, the surrounding area is not characterised by a single palette of materials, and contemporary materials are evident within the locality. The zinc cladding, while more contemporary in appearance, would be limited to the recessed upper floor. In light of the dwelling's set-back position, and the varied material context of the area, it would not appear incongruous or cause harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or wider area.
11. No objection has been raised by the Council in respect of the single-storey rear extensions, and I agree with that position. These elements are visually discreet and typical of domestic scale alterations. They would not adversely affect the character or appearance of the dwelling or its surroundings.
12. The proposal would sit comfortably within its generous plot and would reflect the varied and evolving character of development in the area. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which, amongst other things, aim to ensure that new development is of high quality and respects local character.

Other Matter

13. The appellant's evidence refers to an occupier that, from what is set out, may have protected characteristics under the Equalities Act 2010. However, as I have found the appeal scheme acceptable on its planning merits, I have not considered this matter further.

Conditions

14. I have considered the comments within the appellants evidence and the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework and advice in the Planning Practice Guidance: *Use of planning conditions*.
15. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, a modified condition specifying the relevant plans and Fire Strategy document is necessary to provide certainty. As this already secures compliance with the Fire Strategy document, there is no need for a separate condition on this.
16. A modified condition requiring the prior approval of external materials is reasonable and necessary in the interests of character and appearance. The acceptability of the proposal does not depend on the use of any specific material, and contemporary materials may be acceptable where they are of high quality and appropriately integrated.
17. In the interests of protecting the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, it is necessary and reasonable to impose a modified condition, removing words for precision, restricting the use of the flat roof of the proposed extensions.

18. Further, I am satisfied that a modified condition, removing words for precision, requiring the provision of a water butt is justified as the site is located in an area with potential for ground water flooding.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole. Having had regard to all other relevant material considerations the appeal should be allowed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR