
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by **J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/25/3374148

7 Beeches Road, Sutton SM3 9NA

- 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, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Lam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref is DM2025/00957.
 - The development proposed is 'single storey rear extension 6m.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposal constitutes development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ('the GPDO').

Reasons

3. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO contains a permitted development right for the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse. This right is subject to certain limitations and conditions. Of these, the Council considers that the proposal would be contrary to the limitations at paragraphs A.1(j) and A.1(ja).
4. Paragraph A.1(j) provides 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, amongst other things, have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. The term 'original' is defined in the GPDO as meaning, in essence, as existing on 1st July 1948, or if built after this date, as so built.
5. Paragraph A.1(ja) additionally requires that any total enlargement, being the proposed enlarged part together with any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which it would be joined, must not exceed the limits in sub-paragraphs including A.1(j).
6. The proposed rear extension would span the full width of the two-storey part of the appeal dwelling, replacing existing projections which comprise a single-storey flat-roof projection across most of the rear elevation, and a shallower rear projection with a sloping roof closest to the boundary with the adjoining neighbour at 9 Beeches Road.

7. The Council considers that the shallower projection on the boundary with No 9 is part of the original dwelling as shown by historic maps for the property, but the appellant disagrees and asserts that the rear wall of the dwelling was flush with no projections. In support of this position, the appellant has provided a copy of a land registry plan date stamped 1956. However, and leaving aside that this plan post-dates 1948 and so would not necessarily indicate the 'original' dwelling for the purposes of the GPDO, land registry plans are intended to show the general position of boundaries. Accordingly, they are somewhat generalised and may not capture the full detail of buildings as would be shown on large-scale Ordnance Survey historic mapping which I consider would offer a more reliable representation and which I would generally expect to be provided to demonstrate the historic arrangement of a building where this is contested.
8. Given the relatively modest width and depth of the shallower rear projection on the boundary with No 9, it is not improbable that it could have been omitted from mapping underpinning the land registry plan. In my view, this plan is not therefore compelling evidence that the rear elevation of the original dwelling was flush.
9. Moreover, the appellant's appeal submission includes a document named 'Historical Map Extract' which appears to be an extract of a larger-scale Ordnance Survey map. This is not dated, but illustrates a stepped rear elevation to the appeal dwelling, with a less deep section closest to the boundary with 9 Beeches Road which appears broadly consistent with the arrangement that I observed on site. However, it also shows matching small outriggers either side of the common boundary to the rear of the adjacent pair of dwellings at 3 and 5 Beeches Road, similar to the shallower projection to the appeal dwelling. Insofar as Nos 3 and 5 are of generally similar overall form, design and layout to Nos 7 and 9, they appear to be contemporaneous and the illustration of the outriggers on the boundary suggests to me that this could well have been an original feature of the dwellings here. In my view, this adds weight to the Council's argument that the shallower projection to the appeal dwelling is part of the original dwellinghouse.
10. On the strength of the evidence that is before me in this appeal, I am not persuaded that the shallower projection on the boundary with No 9 can reasonably be determined to be non-original and I find on the balance of probability that it should instead be considered to be part of the original dwelling.
11. Insofar as the proposed development would extend beyond the side of this projection, it would therefore extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. Because it would also have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse, it would consequently fail to satisfy the requirements of paragraph A.1(j).
12. Given that the proposal would effectively fully replace the existing projections rather than being joined to an existing enlargement to the rear of the dwelling, I do not consider that there would be an additional failure to satisfy the limitation at paragraph A.1(ja).
13. Nevertheless and notwithstanding that there were no objections to the proposal from neighbouring occupiers, the failure to satisfy the limitation at paragraph A.1(j) means that I conclude that the development would not be permitted under Class A.
14. The appellant refers to experience making similar applications in other local authority areas. However, no firm details have been provided and whether or not

the same strategy and drawing standards were employed, it is unclear that any sites were directly comparable to the appeal property in respect of the presence of any pre-existing rear projections. It is not therefore apparent that the Council in this case has applied a different or incorrect interpretation to the legislation and the applications made in other areas do not alter my assessment of the appeal proposal which I have considered according to the specific circumstances of the site and the evidence that is before me.

15. I have also noted the appellant's submissions regarding the reasons for and need for the proposal and a lack of harm to neighbouring occupiers. However, such matters of broader planning judgment are not relevant to the assessment of whether or not a proposal would comply with the requirements of Class A, and do not alter my conclusion that the appeal scheme would not be permitted development under this Class. Nevertheless, it would be open to the appellant to make an application to the Council for planning permission.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would not be permitted development under the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR