



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3372044

92 Northway Road, Croydon CR0 6JF

- 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 Munir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01727/HSE.
 - The development is described as, 'retention of detached outbuilding for use as recreation room/home office'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. From the evidence and my observations during the site visit, the development has been carried out and appears to be the same as the drawings before me. In the interests of certainty, I have assessed the scheme based on the submitted drawings.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 94 Northway Road (No 94) with regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No 92 Northway Road (No 92) lies on a residential street dominated by semi-detached two storey dwellings with modest rear gardens. Accordingly, the area has a residential character and appearance. Many gardens in the surrounding area feature modest outbuildings in the rear gardens such that they form part of the residential character of the area.
5. The outbuilding in the adjacent garden at No 90 Northway Road (No 90) is rectangular and occupies a large portion of the length of the rear garden. However, from the evidence, the outbuildings along Northway Road are a modest size and generally sited at the end of the garden. Those outbuildings that are narrow in shape generally appear smaller than the outbuilding at No 90 and are located on

Westbourne Road to the rear of the site. Accordingly, long outbuildings that occupy a large part of the garden are not generally characteristic of Northway Road.

6. The outbuilding erected at the appeal site extends along most of the length of the rear garden and is larger than typical outbuildings in the surrounding area. It has a flat roof, and it is noticeably taller than the outbuilding at No 90. The remaining space in the rear garden appears sufficient for the needs of the occupiers. However, given its length and height, the outbuilding harmfully dominates the rear garden of No 92 and detracts from the prevailing pattern of development along Northway Road that is largely characterised by smaller outbuildings sited at the rear of the gardens.
7. Although the outbuilding is located to the rear of the dwelling at No 92, it can be seen from the street between Nos 90 and 92. The outbuilding can also be seen from the rear of neighbouring properties along both Northway Road and Westbourne Road to the rear. Accordingly, given its form and size, the outbuilding unacceptably detracts from the residential character of the surrounding area.
8. The property at No 94 has a rear single storey extension and an outbuilding sited at the end of the rear garden. The remaining portion of garden at this may be similar to that at the appeal site in terms of area. However, as the decked space at the appeal site is long and narrow, it appears more cramped than the garden area at No 94 which occupies the full width of the plot.
9. There seems to be no policy requirement for green or grassed areas in rear gardens. However, the outbuilding nonetheless dominates the rear garden of No 92 and harmfully detracts from the residential character of the area. Therefore, a condition securing soft landscaping would not mitigate the harm identified.
10. Consequently, the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Therefore, it conflicts with Policy D3 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021 (London Plan) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) which together seek, among other things, development that enhance local context and respect the surrounding area.

Living conditions

11. The outbuilding has a clear glazed window that faces No 94. As a home office the outbuilding at No 92 would be likely to be occupied for significant parts of the day. The boundary fence between the two properties is a moderate height such that there is some visibility from the window to the outbuilding at No 94.
12. However, given the height of the fence, the view is primarily of the areas above head height when standing in the outbuilding. As the room serving the window is a home office, it is unlikely that occupiers would be standing at the window for significant lengths of time. Accordingly, the outbuilding does not unduly affect the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers at No 94.
13. The view from the outbuilding window to the rear extension of No 94 is oblique such that the privacy of occupiers is not unduly harmed. There is limited view from the outbuilding door towards the rear extension at No 94. However, given the

height of the boundary fence, the view is largely above head height and does not result in harm to the occupiers in this particular respect.

14. In terms of outlook, while the outbuilding dominates the rear garden of No 92, as the garden at No 94 benefits from outlook in other directions, the building does not result in an oppressive outlook at No 94.
15. Consequently, the development does not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 94 with regard to privacy and outlook. Therefore, it does not conflict with London Plan Policy D3 and LP Policies SP4 and DM10 which together seek, among other things, development that delivers appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity, protects the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining buildings and enhances well-being.

Other Matters

16. I note the evidence regarding the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular effective use of under-utilised land and sustainable development. I also acknowledge the evidence regarding incremental densification. However, given the unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area identified above, these matters do not override the harm identified and have not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR