

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2016

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/16/3153449

9 Chapman Road, Croydon CR0 3NX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chandrakant Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/02459/GPDO, dated 9 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension up to 6m including existing 3m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal is permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015(GPDO), having particular regard to the width of the proposed extension.

Reasons

3. Class A of the GPDO permits the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse. Paragraph A.1. (j) (iii) states that development is not permitted if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.
 4. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi detached dwelling with existing single storey side and rear extensions. The proposed rear extension would extend across the full width of the existing rear and extensions and would extend beyond the original side elevation of the dwelling. The width of the extension would be greater than half the width of the original dwelling and as such would therefore fail to comply with paragraph A.1. (j) (iii) of the GPDO and is not permitted development.
 5. As I have found that the proposal is not permitted development, there is no need for me to consider its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises.
-

6. Though I note that the appellant has expressed a willingness to reduce the width of the proposed extension if necessary, no amended plans have been submitted and I must therefore assess the proposal as shown on the plans submitted to and determined by the Council.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR