
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/25/3374082

80 Croydon Road, Beddington CR0 4PD

- 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 & Mrs Paramalingam and Idhayamalar Chandrakumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2025/00814.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “double storey rear extension including alterations to roof form and removal of chimney stack”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 78 Croydon Road, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling. It is located within an area which is predominantly in residential use, albeit with a school immediately to the west and some commercial uses south of Croydon Road. The surrounding area includes plots of varying sizes with properties set back from Croydon Road by inconsistent distances.
4. The appeal proposal is a rear extension extending the full width of the property. The proposed extension would result in the built form of the appeal property extending the full length of the rear garden at No 78 and beyond.
5. The positioning of the appeal property, set back from Croydon Road by a greater distance than No 78, means that built form already extends some way along the garden of No 78. However, I observed on site that, although there is built form associated with the Link Secondary School in the distance, the outlook from No 78 to the north and west is relatively open and verdant beyond the existing built form at the appeal property.
6. The introduction of additional built form at the rear of the appeal property would erode the openness of this outlook, as observed from the rear of No 78. Even though built form would not be immediately adjacent to the shared boundary, the effect on the outlook would be perceived from the multiple windows on the ground and first floors of the northern elevation of No 78 as well as from the rear garden. As such, the harmful effect on the outlook of the occupiers of No 78, would be considerable.

7. My attention has been drawn to an existing planning permission for a rear extension at the appeal property (DM2024/00578). Although no plans have been provided, I understand that the approved extension is smaller in scale, having a lesser depth and width. In this regard, the approved extension does not appear to be directly comparable to the proposal before me. In any event, each case must be determined on its own individual circumstances, and I have reasoned above why I have identified harm with the proposal before me.
8. I appreciate the frustrations of the appellant in relation to discrepancies within the Council's report on the application regarding the effect of the proposed development on the outlook from No 78. Nonetheless, I have assessed the appeal on the basis of the plans before me and my observations on site. As such, this matter does not lessen the harm I have identified on the main issue.
9. Taking account of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 78, with particular reference to outlook. As such, the proposal does not accord with the relevant provisions of Policy 29 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031. This policy, amongst other matters, seeks development which does not adversely affect the amenities of those currently occupying adjoining or nearby properties, including taking into consideration outlook and sense of enclosure.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the Council does not object to the proposed development in character and appearance terms and that the property is not located within a Conservation Area. Furthermore, by reason of the positioning of the properties and siting of proposed windows, the proposed development is not likely to harm the privacy for the occupiers of No 78. Nevertheless, these matters do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.
11. No objections were received from neighbours in response to the application. However, this matter is a neutral factor in my decision, as it does not in itself indicate a lack of harm.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt
INSPECTOR