



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3374414

18 Essenden Road, South Croydon CR2 0BU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sajith Suresh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/02293/GPDO.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for an award of costs against the Council is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have used the description of development found in the application form in the banner heading above. I note that on the decision notice and appeal form it was described as 'Erection of a single storey rear extension which projects out from the original rear wall of the property by 8 metres with an eave's height of 2.5 metres and a maximum height of 3 metres at 18 Essenden Road, South Croydon, CR2 0BU'.
4. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement, improvement or alteration of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
5. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) of the GPDO but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g), paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply with the pertinent conditions, limitations or restrictions.
6. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension to a detached dwellinghouse. In order to qualify as Permitted Development the proposal must comply with the pertinent conditions, limitations or restrictions, including that it not extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The dwelling has two rearward-facing plains, connected by a wall of some 59cm (the wall). The Council

considers this wall to form a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, resulting in the application refusal.

7. Whilst the decision notice refers to the proposal not complying with the criteria of Paragraph A.1 (i) of Class A, when it is in fact A.1 (j) which is relevant, it is clear that this error has had no effect on either party's understanding of the issue.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be granted planning permission by Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, with particular regard to whether the wall forms a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse.

Reasons

9. The 'permitted development rights for householders technical guidance' (2019) (the guidance) defines a 'side elevation' as 'any wall that cannot be identified as being a front wall or a rear wall', stating also that 'Houses will often have more than two side elevation walls'. A supporting diagram shows a dwelling in plan view, and identifies three of its walls as forming a side elevation. These connect the staggered rearward-facing plains of the dwelling. Each is in alignment with the other, and each is at a right angle to the front and rear elevations.
10. The wall at the appeal site dwelling is at a right angle to the two rearward-facing plains and to the front elevation. It aligns with the main side walls of the dwelling. It is clearly distinguishable as part of the side elevation of the dwelling on the submitted 'existing elevations' drawing, the accuracy of which I have found no reason to doubt. On this basis, it forms a side elevation.
11. The wall has been described as a 'slight kink in the rear building line', leading me to question whether it is indeed 'a wall' for the purposes of the GPDO. It is deep enough to result in a distinct hipped roof above it, one which projects beyond the main rear roofline. The wall therefore has some significance in the shape and form of the dwelling, and is not so inconsequential that I could discount it as 'a wall' for the purposes of the GPDO.
12. As brought to my attention by the appellant, the guidance states that 'Where the original rear wall of a house is stepped, then each of these walls will form the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse'. I do not see that this supports the appeal. The guidance does not state that walls which connect rearward-facing walls should be considered part of the rear wall. In fact, insofar as it provides any indication, it suggests this is not the case.
13. The guidance goes on to say: 'In such cases, the limits on extensions apply to any of the rear walls being extended beyond'. This is supported by a diagram showing a dwelling with a 'stepped' rear in three plains, each of which could lawfully be extended rearwards. Each of the extensions are measured in a straight-line rearward from the rear-facing plains, not sideways from the connecting walls. None of the extensions envelope a connecting wall. If anything, this suggests that it is the rearward facing plains that comprise the rear wall, and not walls which connect them.
14. Overall, I see no reason to identify the wall at the appeal site as a rear wall and conclude that the proposed extension is not permitted development under the terms of the GPDO. As the proposal does not constitute permitted development

there is no requirement for me to consider the effect of the proposal on the neighbouring amenity of all adjoining premises, or to assess it against planning policy.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has drawn my attention to pre-application advice from the Council. Insofar as my determination of the appeal is concerned, I must reach my own conclusion based on the evidence before me.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

A Knight

INSPECTOR