



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3374646

35 Selsdon Road, South Croydon CR2 6PY

- 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 J Croos against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01004/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “proposal of a flexible outhouse in the rear garden of the existing property 35 Selsdon Road. This proposal will be within the properties curtilage and will occupy less than 50% of the total garden area”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has submitted revised plans as part of the appeal process, reducing the size of the proposed structure. Section 16 of the Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England (2025) advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and by interested parties at the application stage.
3. The revised proposal is substantially different to that originally submitted to the Council, consulted upon and upon which the Council based its decision. As such, accepting the revised plans at this stage would prejudice the interests of the Council and also deprive those entitled to be consulted on an application the opportunity to make a representation. Therefore, my decision is based on the development proposals before the Council when the application was determined.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached property located within an area which is predominantly residential in character. The appeal property and the majority of properties within the immediate surroundings have relatively long rear gardens which are largely formed of open green space, albeit some contain modestly sized outbuildings.

6. The proposal would be a new structure, which the appellant refers to as an outhouse, which would be located at the rear of the garden. The outhouse would extend across the full width of the garden and be in excess of 10m in length at its longest point. In this regard, the proposed outhouse would be substantially larger than outbuildings in surrounding area. Consequently, it would appear incongruous.
7. Moreover, the outhouse would occupy a substantial proportion of the rear garden, resulting in the outdoor space provided at the appeal property being significantly reduced. As such, the garden would no longer be in-keeping with the surrounding area which is characterised by properties set within relatively long open green spaces.
8. The outhouse has been designed to enable the retention of the existing tree within the garden, which I observed on site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. However, even taking into consideration the retention of the tree, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. As such, the proposal would not accord with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018. These policies, among other matters, seek development which respects, responds to and enhances local character and context, including through layout, scale and appearance, and maintains design quality.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the outhouse has been designed to provide flexible space which helps to maximise the effective use of the property whilst remaining a single dwelling. It would be constructed in the highest part of the garden to minimise the risk of flooding with materials which reduce fire risk complement the existing dwelling. It would include design features which enable natural light to enter as well as sustainability measures such as rainwater harvesting. Storage space would allow for the existing shed to be removed from the garden.
11. The siting and height of the outhouse would limit any impact upon daylight and sunlight entering into neighbouring properties. In addition, obscure glazing on the side elevation of the proposed outhouse would minimise impacts upon privacy. Access would be via the existing property or existing side path only limiting the potential for disturbance to neighbours. Nevertheless, the absence of harm in these areas is a neutral matter and does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue or lessen the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no relevant material considerations which indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt
INSPECTOR