



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/25/3364717

29 Campbell Road, Croydon CR0 2SQ

- 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 GW Kalanzi and Mrs Mukasa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/02530/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: change of use from bed and breakfast to residential family centre.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether there is an identified need for the proposal; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Identified need

3. Policy H12 of the London Plan – Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) (the London Plan) states that the delivery, retention and refurbishment of supported and specialised housing which meets an identified need should be supported. The policy provides examples of the type of supported specialised accommodation could include, however this is not an exhaustive list.
4. The Statement of Purpose submitted describes the proposal as providing a unique and specialised service for families undergoing tailored parenting assessments with 24/7 Support and Supervision. The proposal would additionally offer therapeutic services, including counselling and family therapy. As such, the proposal would be considered supported and specialised housing as set out within Policy H12 of the London Plan.
5. The appellant contends that key stakeholders were consulted with regard for the need for a family assessment centre. These stakeholders included Croydon's Placements Department, in addition to family assessment centres within and outside of Croydon, all indicating a high demand for such services. Nonetheless, the appellant has supplied little evidence of this correspondence, and I can

therefore only afford this limited weight. The Council consulted their Strategic Commissioning Lead Sufficiency and Children in Care who concluded that the proposal would not provide specialist or additional service provision beyond that which is already available. As such, given the appellant's limited evidence, the proposal would not meet an identified need for supported specialised accommodation.

6. I note there is disagreement between the Council and the appellant as to whether Policy H12 of the London Plan relates to the need for supported specialised accommodation within individual boroughs or the wider London area. Even if I were to conclude that the policy extended to the wider London area, the appellant's evidence does not sufficiently demonstrate an identified need for the proposal.
7. For the above reasons there would not be an identified need for the proposed development. As such the proposal would conflict with Policy H12 of the London Plan, the aims of which are outlined above.

Living conditions for neighbouring occupiers

8. The proposal would replace an existing bed and breakfast (B&B) which the appellant states has a maximum occupancy of 14 guests, supported by the submitted floor plans showing 8 bedrooms. The area surrounding the appeal site is residential in character. The existing B&B use involves guests arriving and departing at varying times throughout the day with these comings and goings likely to generate some level of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.
9. The proposal would be limited to six adults, four children and two staff totalling twelve individuals, slightly less than that of the existing use. The submitted Statement of Purpose (2024) sets out visiting procedure, limiting visiting hours to between 10:00 am and 6:00 pm Sunday to Friday, and 10:00 am and 8:00 pm on Saturdays. Given the limited visiting hours and reduced number of occupiers compared to the existing use, it is likely that there would be fewer comings and goings during late-night and early-morning hours. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in an intensification of use, that would harmfully increase levels of noise and disturbance of neighbouring occupiers.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal would be acceptable in respect to its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to noise and disturbance. As such, it would not conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) and Policy D13 of the London Plan. When read together these policies require development to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and manage noise.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposal will create employment opportunities and contribute to local businesses, in addition to social benefits. Given the small scale of the proposal, these benefits will be modest and not outweigh the above identified harm.
12. The proposal would not involve any external alterations, preserving the character of the area, neither would it effect parking conditions or ecology. Nonetheless, these are neutral points and weigh neither for nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and the Framework taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations which indicate that the decision should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR