



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2026

by **G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3375091**

**72 Montpelier Road, Purley, Croydon CR8 2QA**

- 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 Kingsley Scott against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref is 25/01465/HSE.
  - The development is the installation of bike store at front of property.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The development has already been carried out. On site it was apparent to me that there was a slight inconsistency between the submitted plans and what I saw, with the bike store appearing to be slightly longer than that shown on the plans. Nevertheless, in either regard, in considering the reasons for refusal, the effect of the development would appear to be largely the same.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
  - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
  - The effect of the development on highway safety, with particular regard to pedestrians.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal site is located along a relatively quiet residential road. The host dwelling is a terraced house and there are other similar properties nearby which share a similar form, character and appearance. The houses are typically set well down from the road and built into a steep bankside with sloping gardens running up to the road or raised platforms to accommodate parking areas. The relative position of the houses to the raised parking areas means that the hard standings are almost level with the first floor of the properties.

5. At my visit, I saw relatively open frontages to the properties with lengthy views along the road, punctuated mainly by relatively low boundary hedges and fences, shrubs and parked cars.
6. The bike store subject to this appeal was immediately noticeable in the lengthy views along the road. It appeared to stand far higher than any other boundary fences or railings or other structures in a similar position, and its solid, boxy form and white finish drew attention to its presence. Due to the close relationship with the house and the relative ground levels, the development had a significant and dominating presence alongside the house and on those nearby. It was high enough to sit in front of the first floor window of the host dwelling and its scale was substantial in relation to the size of the front garden. It therefore looked decidedly incongruous, in front of the dwellings, and jarring and out of place within more distant views.
7. The existing storage structure at No.68 Montpelier Road did not have the same height or presence on its parking area as the appeal development given its lower height, slatted timber construction and more articulated form. The raised platforms may have been a more recent installation, but adding further structures of significant form and massing on them is not a logical progression given the site context. In this regard, many typical larger domestic structures such as sheds and garages would be unlikely to be acceptable in this location.
8. The appellant suggests that the bike store is a practical and sustainable solution, supporting the Council's travel objectives to promote cycling, and contributes to environmental sustainability. Whilst this development is a practical facility which meets the needs of the appellant and maximises the use of the parking facility, it is not adequately explained why the structure needs to be of this height, form and appearance or why it needs to be in this location. In this regard, several representations suggest that the host dwelling has a rear garage/store. Whilst the promotion of cycling is an important consideration, the circumstances of each case need to be considered, and other factors must weigh in the balance.
9. Conditions attached to an approval such as to control materials, colour, landscaping or siting would not adequately mitigate the appearance of the appeal development given the prominence of the structure that I have described.
10. Drawing the above together, I find that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) and Policies SP4 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) (CLP) which require that development respects and enhances local character. Also, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks to achieve well designed places.

#### *Highway safety*

11. The road appeared to be relatively quiet in terms of traffic flow, and it was designated as a pedestrian and cycle zone with a 20mph speed limit. The pavement near to the appeal site was wide and there was some street parking.
12. The cycle store occupies part of the existing raised parking area. The appellant advises that he does not currently have use of a car and does not use the parking area for that purpose. However, whilst these might be the existing arrangements, I am not certain that the appellant's circumstances would not change in the future.

Also, visitors to the property may look to use the remaining space to park. It may be that there is street parking nearby, but I have little evidence of availability or where the appellant previously parked before the construction of the parking platform. Therefore, although the appellant may not park a car on the parking platform, I am not able to rule out the fact that this does not currently occur with guest parking, and it may happen more often in future. I also need to consider the actions of future occupants. The effect of car parking on this platform is therefore relevant to this appeal.

13. The Council has expressed concern that if a car parks in the remaining space, the driver exiting that space may not see a passing pedestrian because of the visual obstruction caused by the store. Also, that to open car doors or to manoeuvre a bike into the store, the car may hang back onto the pavement causing an obstruction, albeit most likely a temporary one. Therefore, despite the light traffic flow and width of the pavement, due to the proximity of this tall, solid structure, I am not satisfied that a vehicle using this space would not pose a hazard to pedestrians.
14. The appellant suggests that households in Croydon manage constrained driveways where parking and storage co-exist, also that along Montpelier Road itself there are similar if not worse visual obstructions. However, little evidence has been submitted to provide examples or to demonstrate how these situations are comparable to the appeal case, and I certainly was not aware of similar occurrences in the area. Whilst irresponsible or unlawful parking behaviour could be managed under other legislation, this does not address the risk of an unintended incident occurring. There may be no evidence of recorded accidents in this area. However, that does not mean that future developments would not increase the risk.
15. Looking at all the evidence before me, I am not satisfied that the development would not have a harmful impact on highway safety, with particular regard to pedestrians. It would conflict with LP Policy T4 and CLP Policies DM29 and DM30. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development has no detrimental impact on highway safety for pedestrians. It also conflicts with the Framework which seeks to create safe and accessible places.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Bayliss*

INSPECTOR