



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

**by E Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 30<sup>th</sup> May 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/21/3289676**

**49 Bridle Road, Croydon CR0 8HP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Joseph Adams (Adams Property Partnership Ltd) against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 21/01381/FUL, dated 17 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2021.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey 2-bedroom house.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposed development in the banner heading above has been taken from the appeal form rather than the application form as it represents a more accurate description of the proposal detailed within the submitted plans.

## Main Issues

1. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and
  - whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers, with regard to outlook and light.

## Reasons

### *Character and Appearance*

2. The appeal site is an area of vacant land on Ash Road, to the rear of the building on 49 Bridle Road which accommodates four flats. The surrounding area is residential in nature with a variety of dwelling styles, largely comprising detached or semi-detached dwellings on relatively large plots set back from the road.
3. Although the proposed development is designed to appear as a subservient outbuilding to the main building at No.49, the presence of a separate entrance and subdivision from the main property would give the proposal a markedly different appearance, as a standalone dwelling. Its proximity to and lack of setback from the road would make it a prominent addition in the streetscene

and its side-on positioning would appear at odds with other properties along Ash Road. Therefore, although the proposed dwelling would be modest in size with a modern design, the proposal would not respect the surrounding pattern of development and would appear visually awkward within the streetscene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

4. The west facing elevation would only have minimal views from the public realm, through and above the existing semipermeable boundary fence and from the host dwelling. However, it would still be visible to its occupiers and to the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No.49. The lack of windows would result in a large blank elevation which would add to the incongruous appearance of the building.
5. It is noted that the outbuilding to the rear of 47 Bridle Road, which is also adjacent to Ash Road, would be similar in size to the proposed dwelling and that the proposal is intended to assimilate this building. However, whilst it has access onto Ash Road, this building is incidental to the main dwelling at No.47 with a simple garage-like appearance and no separate domestic activities. Therefore, it does not appear as a self-contained property, unlike the proposal before me.
6. In conclusion, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies SP4.1 and DM10.1 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021). These policies collectively seek to ensure new development is high quality, by delivering good design and respecting the development pattern, layout and siting of the surrounding area whilst responding to local distinctiveness.
7. It would also conflict with the Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2019) which requires development in suburban locations to improve or positively contribute to the local character.

#### *Living Conditions*

8. The joint kitchen/living room would be served by a window and glazed patio doors overlooking a small courtyard area adjacent to the entrance to the site. Whilst the appellant contends this courtyard could be used for outdoor seating and dining opportunities, the space available for this would be limited due to the close proximity to the boundary and entrance. Due to its size, the area would appear cramped and enclosed and would not provide a sufficient outlook for the occupiers of the dwelling from either window when using this room.
9. The assessment provided by the appellant, dated 21 December 2021 and relating to light, indicates that the kitchen/living room would receive sufficient daylight to accord with BRE recommendations. However, it also states that kitchen/living room would fall short of the recommended probable sunlight hours. Whilst other rooms may be available to the occupants which provide sufficient sunlight, as the main communal living space, a lack of sunlight along with the inadequate outlook discussed above would not provide acceptable living conditions for the future occupiers.
10. It is noted that the Suburban Design Guide SPD (2019) supports the use of a courtyard space to provide access to natural light on constrained sites. However, this illustrates a much more constrained site than the appeal before

me, with minimal outdoor space and little to no externally facing windows. Therefore, it is not directly comparable.

11. One window serving the double bedroom would be in close proximity to the southern boundary fence, which would somewhat impede the outlook from this room. However, this room is dual aspect and a secondary window overlooking the garden would provide a less oppressive outlook and provide sufficient daylight and sunlight into the room. The window serving the single bedroom would also face the southern boundary fence. However, this would be set further back from the boundary and therefore the fence would not significantly hamper outlook from this room or the light it receives.
12. Nevertheless, due to the poor outlook from the kitchen/living room, the proposed dwelling would not provide satisfactory living conditions for its future occupiers and would conflict with Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy D6 of The London Plan. These policies seek to ensure that development provides adequate sunlight and daylight to future occupants.
13. It would also be contrary to the section of the Suburban Design Guide SPD (2019) which requires new development to have well positioned windows in relation to room layout.

### **Other Matters**

14. It is noted that the proposal would provide one additional dwelling. However, due to the minimal nature of the proposed development, as a single dwelling, the benefits of additional housing would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*E Grierson*

INSPECTOR