



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/25/3368822

10 Woodstock Road, Croydon CR0 1JR

- 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 Andreas Photiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application ref is 25/00112/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use from a single dwelling (use class C3) to a large 7 bedroom, 8 person HMO (sui generis use class), including the introduction of velux windows to the roof plane and the demolition of the existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use from a single dwelling (use class C3) to a large 7 bedroom, 8 person HMO (sui generis use class), including the introduction of velux windows to the roof plane and the demolition of the existing conservatory at 10 Woodstock Road, Croydon, CR0 1JR in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 25/00112/FUL and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Andreas Photiou against the Council of the London Borough of Croydon. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development listed in the application form refers to “a conversion of a single dwelling house into 8 person HMO units”. This description is unclear that the development is for a seven bedroom house in multiple occupation (HMO), with eight occupiers. As such, in the interests of clarity, I have used the description of development as set out on the Council’s decision notice in my formal decision. This description has also been used in Section E of the appellants appeal form to describe the development.
4. A planning obligation was submitted with the appeal which would restrict future occupiers of the development from applying for parking permits. Amendments to the document were made during the appeal process, primarily to address small drafting errors within the original submission. The Council disputes that the obligation was originally submitted with the appeal. However, the Council was given the opportunity to comment upon the final executed planning obligation, and as such I am satisfied there is no procedural or substantive reason not to accept it.

5. It has been raised in representations that works have commenced at the site. At the time of my site visit I did not observe any clear signs that the development had commenced. In any case, I have assessed the proposal on the basis of the plans before me.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:
- the effect on the character of the area, including on the Chatsworth Road Conservation Area; and
 - whether a planning obligation is required to restrict the access of future occupiers from being able to obtain parking permits and contracts, and to remove the existing front crossover and secure the reinstatement of the curb.

Reasons

Character

7. The appeal site is situated within the Chatsworth Road Conservation Area (CA). In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
8. The CA Appraisal and Management Plan (2013) (the CAAMP) identifies that the special interest of the CA lies in the value of a substantial grouping of Victorian and Edwardian houses of high architectural quality with an overall residential character. It describes that the delicate and detailed decorative features on many properties greatly enriches the overall character and appearance of the area, whilst common architectural characteristics provide notable cohesion and group value of buildings. Buildings are sited within relatively large plots and set back from the wide and mostly tree-lined roads. The area is described as quiet and secluded relative to, and dramatically contrasts with, the nearby Croydon town centre.
9. Specifically, the site is situated within the Woodstock Road character area of the CA. This is described as the CA's most architecturally consistent road with runs of semi-detached Victorian houses. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two storey property with roof accommodation and projecting two storey bay windows. The CAAMP specifically identifies 10 Woodstock Road (No 10) as having intricately carved bargeboards with finials and elaborately detailed parapets above the bay windows, and terracotta decoration on the gables. In this regard, the architectural detailing of the appeal property and its presence as a residential property positively contributes to the CA.
10. The plans show that No 10 is a four-bedroom dwelling, with at least one of the rooms appearing clearly suitable as a double room. It is therefore reasonable to assume that it could presently be occupied by a single household as a large family dwelling.
11. The proposed development would have seven bedrooms, which would be occupied by eight individuals. It is likely the occupants of the appeal proposal would have their own individual routines, resulting in people entering and leaving the property at different times of the day. However, there would only be a limited

number of additional occupiers of the property compared to the existing large family dwelling. As a result, the movements and activity associated with the development would be at a level and intensity in keeping with the existing level at the site and would not be readily discernible from the surrounding residential properties within the area.

12. Whilst there may be other flats or houses of multiple occupation within the area, the introduction of the appeal proposal would not generate a level of movements or activity that would undermine the quiet and secluded residential character of the CA. As a result, the host property would retain its residential character and would be in keeping with the quiet residential character of the area. The proposal would result in no harm to and would preserve the character of the CA in this regard.
13. In relation to the physical alterations to the property, these include the introduction of a single roof light to the front and rear roof slope, and the demolition of the existing conservatory. Furthermore, a refuse and cycle store are proposed to the rear of the property. The Council has not included these elements of the proposal in its reason for refusal. I also see no reason to raise an objection to these elements of the development either, due to their unimposing appearance on the host building and wider area. Furthermore, the positive contribution the appeal building makes to the CA through its architectural features and detailing would also be retained by the development. In these circumstances, the proposal would therefore not harm the appearance of the host building and therefore preserve its contribution to the appearance of the CA.
14. The appeal proposal would result in no harm to the character of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The appeal proposal would therefore comply with Policy DM18 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure proposals affecting heritage assets should only be permitted where the significance is preserved or enhanced.

Planning Obligation

15. Whilst not forming a reason for refusal, the evidence shows the Council considers that a planning obligation is required to restrict future occupiers from being able to obtain parking permits and contracts for controlled parking zones and Council controlled car parks, and to remove the front crossover at the site and reinstate the curb.
16. Woodstock Road is designated as a controlled parking zone, indicating a level of parking stress within the area. I have no evidence before me demonstrating what the effect of the proposal on the parking stress of the area would be and I therefore cannot conclude the effect would be acceptable on highway safety. As such, a planning obligation to restrict future occupiers of the development from being able to obtain parking permits and contracts is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It would therefore meet the tests as set out in paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
17. I have been provided with an executed unilateral undertaking (UU) which I am satisfied is a legally sound and binding obligation that effectively ensures future occupiers would not be able to obtain parking permits or contracts. Whilst the

Council has raised concern over the dating of the UU, I do not have compelling evidence to show the UU has not been dated and executed correctly. I am therefore satisfied that I can confidently rely on the UU to ensure that there are no adverse impacts of the proposal on the parking stress of the area.

18. The removal of the front crossover and reinstatement of the curb is stated as necessary in the Council's evidence to ensure necessary highway works are undertaken. This provision is not included within the submitted UU. However, I do not consider it to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, given a condition securing hard and soft landscaping could adequately address the frontage area to ensure cars did not park on it. Accordingly, this would not meet the tests set out at paragraph 58 of the Framework, and an absence of this would not weigh against the proposal.
19. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies SP8, DM29 and DM30 of the CLP and Policies T4 and T6 of the LP. These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that proposals do not have a detrimental impact on highway safety or increase road danger and reduce the impact of car parking from proposals on the area.

Other Matters

20. Interested parties have raised concerns regarding the need for the proposal, the loss of a family unit, concern over the size of the rooms and the associated amenity space, accuracy of the plans and accompanying information, noise and disturbance including the potential for anti-social behaviour effecting living conditions of existing residents, along with sewage and waste management. The Council has not raised a concern regarding these matters. The evidence before me does not lead me to a different conclusion to that of the Council.
21. The appeal property is a locally listed building, with its significance deriving from its architectural detailing and residential appearance as previously described, which positively contributes to the CA. The Council has not raised an objection to the effect of the proposal on the non-designated heritage asset itself. Given my findings on the main issue, the positive architectural detailing of the property would be retained as would its residential character and therefore no harm to the significance of the locally listed building would occur.

Conditions

22. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests in the Framework and the advice in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In meeting the tests of the Framework, I have amended the wording of the conditions where necessary.
23. The standard timescale condition for implementation and a plans compliance condition are imposed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
24. A hard and soft landscaping condition is considered necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, limiting on-site parking and ensuring the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the CA.
25. A condition ensuring that the adjoining wall to the conservatory proposed for demolition will be made good using matching materials is reasonable and necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the CA.

26. In the interests of the safety of future occupiers, it is necessary to impose a condition ensuring the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted fire safety statement.
27. It is considered reasonable and necessary, in order to ensure that future occupiers are provided with adequate refuse facilities, that a condition ensuring the refuse storage and management is provided and retained in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation.
28. A condition securing further details of cycle parking is reasonable and necessary in order to ensure the development promotes sustainable and accessible forms of transport, and to ensure the cycle stores are in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and the CA.
29. A condition has been suggested securing a new wall and gate to the site frontage. However, given my findings above relating to character and the CA, a frontage wall and gate would not be necessary to make the development acceptable. I therefore have not imposed such a condition.
30. A condition has been suggested limiting the occupancy of the proposal to a seven bed, eight person HMO. However, this is not necessary as the occupancy is included within the description of the development. I am satisfied that the terms of the planning permission are robust and would be able to be enforced by the Council through enforcement procedures should this be necessary in the future.

Conclusion

31. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR

-- Schedule of Conditions --

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 24256/04 D, 24256/05 C, 24256/06 C, 24256/07 D, 24256/10 D, 24256/11 E, 24256/14 A, 24256/16 and 24256/20.
- 3) Prior to the commencement of any works other than demolition, full details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) Hard landscaping materials (including samples as appropriate)
 - b) Soft landscaping details, including existing planting to be retained, the species, size and density of proposed new planting, as well as the dimensions of new trees; replacement trees, including no less than two semi mature trees and maintenance.

The details approved shall be provided and completed in accordance with this condition prior to the first occupation of the development, and permanently maintained with the exception of new planting which shall be provided and completed in accordance with this condition prior to the end of the first planting season following completion of the development, and maintained for a period of five years from the date of planting. Any new planting which dies, is severely damaged, becomes seriously diseased or is removed within that period shall be replaced by planting of a similar size and species to that originally planted.

- 4) Prior to occupation of the development, full details of the cycle parking provision, including the type of cycle stands and structures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details approved shall be provided and completed in accordance with this condition prior to the first occupation of the development and permanently retained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Prior to occupation of the development, the bins and their associated storage shall be provided as specified on Proposed Site Plan 24256/10 D and Refuse Management Plan 24256/14 A, and shall thereafter be permanently retained in accordance with the approved plans.
- 6) The demolition of the rear conservatory shall accord with the Proposed Site Plan 24256/10 D and any works of making good shall be carried out using materials to match those of the existing building.
- 7) The development hereby approved shall be carried out and retained at all times thereafter in accordance with the details specified within document titled Fire Safety Statement D12a 10 Woodstock Road Croydon CR0 1JR.

-- End of Schedule --