



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2023

by J Wellstead BA(Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3311280

105 Addiscombe Road, Croydon CR0 6SG

- 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 Ho Yin Wong against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/00880/HSE, dated 1 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2022.
 - The development proposed relates to a replacement boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development as built includes sections of open and closed-panel fencing as well as a gate. However, plans 101A and 102A (1 March 2022) show open-fenced panelling and no gate. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined this appeal based on the plans submitted for the proposed scheme, rather than the development as built.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the (i) character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and (ii) on highway safety with particular regard to visibility.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No.105 occupies a prominent corner plot facing onto Addiscombe Road and Addiscombe Court Road. An existing access road off Addiscombe Road is located between No.105 and The Cricketers Public House. Addiscombe Road is a busy road used by both vehicles and trams. The appeal scheme is for tall, open-panel fencing around the boundary of No.105.
5. During my site visit I saw other examples of a variety of boundary treatments along Addiscombe Road including timber fencing, hedges, open metal railings, chain link, and brick walls with metal railings above. However, these boundary treatments are predominantly shorter in height than the proposed scheme.
6. Although the scheme proposes open fence panels, the height, scale, mass and design of the proposed treatment means it would have an enclosing effect on this part of the street scene and be visually prominent, a harm exacerbated by the appeal site's prominent corner plot location. This would add a discordant feature to the local area.

7. The proposed boundary treatment would maintain a distinction between the appeal site and public space, and it would align with the boundary of the appeal site and the prevailing pattern of development. However, although there are a variety of boundary treatments and built forms in the area and the host dwelling is unique in character in the area, this does not outweigh the harm identified above.
8. The appellant also refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (The "Framework") with regard to economic, social and environmental objectives, presumption in favour of sustainable development and good design. However, the limited economic, social and environmental benefits derived from the scheme do not outweigh the potential harm identified above.
9. Consequently, the appeal scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. This is contrary to Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that proposals respect the appearance, existing materials and built and natural features of the surrounding area. It would also conflict with Policies D4 and D5 of The London Plan 2021¹, which seek good and inclusive design.

Highway safety

10. No.105 is located on the corner of Addiscombe Road and Addiscombe Court Road. The height and position of the proposed scheme would reduce visibility for pedestrians and vehicles manoeuvring around the boundaries of the appeal site.
11. This would result in vehicles entering and exiting the existing access road having difficulty in seeing trams, other vehicles and pedestrians using Addiscombe Road and the adjoining footpath. I note that the existing access road only serves the electricity substation and The Cricketers Public House so only a limited number of vehicles would use this access. However, constrained visibility arising from the replacement boundary treatments is likely to cause conflict between vehicles exiting the existing access road and vehicles, trams and pedestrian users of Addiscombe Road to the detriment of highway safety.
12. The scheme does not propose vehicular access onto the existing access road, which is corroborated by the submitted plans.
13. Consequently, the proposed scheme would be harmful to highway safety with particular regard to visibility and is therefore contrary to LP Policy DM29 of the LP and Policies T1 and T4 of The London Plan 2021. Policy DM29 requires development to not have a detrimental impact on highway safety for pedestrians, public transport and private vehicles. Policies T1 and T4 require all developments ensure that any impacts on London's transport networks and supporting infrastructure are mitigated and should not increase road danger.
14. Policy DM30 of the LP seeks to reduce the impact of car parking so has no relevance to this case which focuses on character and appearance, and highway safety.

¹ The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

J Wellstead

INSPECTOR