



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **G Dring BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MAUDE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/25/3375507

56 Mayfield Road, Croydon CR2 0BF

- 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 J Szadlo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/00546/FUL.
 - The development proposed is alterations, conversion of existing dwelling to form 1x 3-bedroom and 4x 1-bedroom flats, erection of part single/two storey rear extension, two-storey side extension, enlargement of rear roof dormer, provision of additional rooflights and windows, and provision of associated vehicle parking and cycle and refuse storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant has confirmed on the appeal form that the description of development has changed since that provided on the application form. On the appeal form, a description which matches that used by the Council on its decision notice is identified. As it is more precise, I have used the description provided on the appeal form in the banner heading above.
4. Additional information relating to parking demand was submitted by the appellant in response to the Council's comments on the costs application. This was submitted after the deadline for final comments on the appeal and related to the planning merits of the case, rather than purely to the costs application. The Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England is clear that sticking to the timetable is important for appeals to proceed quickly and fairly. Late evidence will only be accepted where there is a change in circumstance including new or emerging policies, new legislation or a relevant decision is made on another case. It is evident that none of these circumstances apply. As such, in the interests of procedural fairness I have not had regard to this information in my assessment of the appeal.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on highway safety with particular regard to parking provision;
- whether the proposal would make appropriate provision for sustainable transport improvements;
- whether the proposal would provide adequate cycle storage facilities; and
- whether the proposal would provide adequate refuse storage facilities.

Reasons

Highway safety

6. The proposal includes alterations to one existing 5-bed dwelling to provide five separate dwellings including one 3-bed dwelling and four 1-bed dwellings. One parking space already exists to the front of the property. The proposal includes the provision of one additional parking space and an extension to an existing vehicle crossover to allow access to both spaces.
7. Whilst I note the proximity of bus stops and the train station, the Council indicates that the appeal site is located within an area designated as Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) 2 which demonstrates relatively poor accessibility to public transport. There is no substantive evidence before me to dispute this rating.
8. Policy DM30 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (CLP) states that in order to promote sustainable growth in Croydon and reduce the impact of car parking, new development must provide car parking spaces as per the London Plan requirements. Table 10.3 set out under Policy T6.1 of The London Plan 2021 (TLP) identifies maximum parking standards of 0.75 spaces per dwelling with 1-2 beds and 1 space per dwelling with 3 or more beds in areas of outer London with a PTAL rating of 2. The Council state that 4 parking spaces would represent the maximum parking standard required for the proposed development. I concur with this calculation.
9. The appellant asserts that the total occupancy of the appeal building as a result of the proposal would only increase from 8 to 9 occupants which would result in very little material difference in occupation. However, the existing dwelling serves one household, and the proposal would result in five separate households. I find that the increase in the number of individual households would be likely to materially increase parking demand. This is because there would not be any interdependence of the occupants of one dwelling on another, like there would be in a single larger household.
10. Whilst I note that the proposed four 1-bed flats would be restricted in the number of occupants, the calculation under Policy T6.1 of TLP recognises this by including a figure of less than 1 space per dwelling for dwellings with 1-2 bed spaces as a maximum requirement. The appellant also provides evidence on the car ownership levels of occupants of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO), nevertheless, the scheme before me is not for a HMO, it is for five separate dwellings.

11. In this location, given the more limited accessibility to public transport, I consider that it is likely that some future residents would be likely to rely on the use of private vehicles. A significant number of properties along Mayfield Road have off street parking and many driveways were in use for the parking of cars at the time of my site visit. I also noted that the significant majority of possible on street parking spaces were occupied at the time of my site visit. Whilst I note that my site visit was a snapshot in time, interested parties who responded to the planning application also raised issues around parking stress along Mayfield Road.
12. Overall, considering these different factors, and without substantive evidence to the contrary, I find that the maximum parking standard is likely to be the most appropriate level of parking required in this location to ensure that highway safety is not harmfully affected.
13. With only two parking spaces proposed off street, it is likely that some future residents would have to find on street parking. The Council has confirmed that the appeal site is not located in a controlled parking area where parking levels could be restricted. Nevertheless, the amount of on street parking in the vicinity of the site is significantly limited by the need to maintain access to existing off street parking spaces. As stated above, at the time of my site visit, I observed that there were a very limited number of on street parking spaces in the vicinity of the appeal site that were not occupied. No evidence has been submitted, such as parking surveys, which suggest the situation is usually different.
14. Consequently, without adequate parking provision on site and without evidence that there is sufficient on street parking options in the local area to cater for the additional parking demand, obstructive parking could take place which could negatively affect highway safety.
15. The proposed arrangement and size of parking spaces along with the vehicle crossover alteration are also raised as concerns by the Council. Both parties refer to the Vehicle Crossover Guidelines (VCG). Whilst the VCG do not form part of the development plan, they can form a material consideration.
16. I agree that the proposed parking provision could have been more clearly identified on the drawings. Nevertheless, I witnessed a fairly standard sized car parked to the front of the bay window of the appeal property during my site visit. There was adequate depth, meaning that the car did not overhang the footpath. I am referred in the evidence to a tree located to the front of the property, nevertheless this had been removed at the time of my site visit and therefore did not impede the proposed parking arrangement.
17. However, the location of the proposed 'car park 1' directly to the front of the side access would be likely to cause an obstruction, particularly when trying to access the proposed rear storage area, with cycles or bins. I note that this is the existing vehicle space directly behind the existing crossover and could be used for the existing dwelling, nevertheless, one household would be able to effectively manage the space. Five separate households needing access to the rear of the property would be likely to result in some conflict in useability and may result in the need for the user of 'car park 1' to move their vehicle to enable sufficient access.
18. The appellant asserts that the proposal includes the extension of the existing crossover, rather than the provision of a second crossover. Although more detailed information could have been provided, the dashed line on the proposed site plan

does suggest this would be the case. I note that the length of the proposed extension to the crossover may result in the total width of the crossover exceeding the accepted figure of 5 metres set out in the VCG. However, more extensive crossovers are a fairly common feature along Mayfield Road, and I am not referred to any specific concerns in relation to how the additional width of crossover would be harmful to highway safety in this case. Nevertheless, my consideration of this particular matter does not overcome my concerns about the provision of parking overall, set out above.

19. I therefore find, without substantive evidence to the contrary, that the proposal would be likely to cause harm to highway safety through insufficient parking provision. The proposal would be contrary to Policies SP8, DM29 and DM30 of the CLP and Policies T4, T6 and T6.1 of TLP. These policies seek, amongst other things, that developments do not have a detrimental impact on highway safety and that car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity.

Sustainable transport improvements

20. The Council's first reason for refusal also refers to the absence of contributions to sustainable travel in the area. Policy SP8 of the CLP states, amongst other things, that new development will be required to contribute to the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, car clubs and car sharing schemes.
21. The Council sets out in its Officer Report that had the application been otherwise acceptable a legal agreement to secure a sustainable transport contribution would have been sought. Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that planning obligations must only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
22. The proposal would lead to the creation of four additional dwellings which could reasonably generate additional demand for initiatives such as car clubs and car sharing schemes. The evidence suggests that a contribution towards sustainable travel improvements is therefore necessary, related to planning and reasonable in all other respects. No legal agreement was provided with the application or as part of the appeal. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not make appropriate provision for sustainable transport improvements. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP8 of the CLP, which seeks, amongst other things, to promote the use of sustainable travel.

Cycle storage facilities

23. Policy T5 of TLP expects development to remove barriers to cycling and create a healthy environment, through securing appropriate cycle parking which should be fit for purpose, secure and well located. It also requires that development proposals demonstrate how cycle parking facilities will cater for larger cycles, including adapted cycles for disabled people. Policy DM30 of the CLP also states that new development must provide cycle parking as set out in Table 10.1, which refers to TLP cycle parking standards.
24. The proposal would provide covered cycle storage in the rear garden area. However, I noted during my site visit that the side access to the rear garden area

where the storage facilities are proposed is limited in width. Without substantive evidence to the contrary, I find that it would be difficult to manoeuvre an adult sized cycle along that access. It has also not been demonstrated how larger cycles would be catered for in light of the more limited accessibility to the rear garden area. Consequently, I find that the constraints of the current cycle storage proposals would not promote cycling as a form of sustainable travel.

25. I therefore find that the proposal would not provide adequate cycle storage facilities. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy T5 of the TLP, the aims of which are set out above. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies SP8, DM29 and DM30 of the CLP which require the provision of cycle parking in new development and the promotion of measures to increase cycling.

Refuse storage facilities

26. The Council refer to Building Regulations Approved Document H which states that refuse storage areas should be sited so that the distance householders are required to carry refuse does not usually exceed 30 metres (excluding any vertical distance) and that containers should be within 25 metres of the waste collection point specified by the waste collection authority. A different figure is provided in the Council's Officer Report which states that future residents must not be required to drag bins more than 30 metres to a collection point.
27. There is dispute between the parties as to the distance that bins would have to be moved to the collection point. However, both the appellant and Council have provided annotated drawings that identify that the distance would be more than 30 metres when taking into account moving them from the storage area to the side access and then along the side access to the edge of the road. I find this distance to be inconvenient. In addition, I witnessed on site that the width of the side access does vary and in places it does feel constrained. I find that due to the distance that bins would need to be moved in combination with the more limited width of the side access, the manoeuvring of bins from the storage area to the collection point would be challenging for future occupants. If a car was parked in 'car park 1' this would also further obstruct the movement of bins.
28. The appellant refers me to 60 Mayfield Road where a similar scheme was approved by the Council. I witnessed this property from the road during my site visit. Whilst I accept that the distance to the rear bin storage may not be dissimilar to that in the scheme before me now, it is not clear what the width of the side access is based on the evidence before me. I also noted the presence of bins on the forecourt area of No 60 during my site visit, meaning that they may not necessarily be stored as indicated on the permitted scheme. Consequently, this does not alter my view on the appeal before me now.
29. I therefore find that the proposed refuse storage facilities would not be adequate. The proposal is contrary to Policy DM13 of the CLP and Policy SI 7 of TLP which seek, amongst other things, that refuse storage should be conveniently located, adequate, flexible and easily accessible. The Council also refers to Policy SI 8 of TLP in its second reason for refusal, however, this refers to waste management sites and I do not consider it directly relevant to the case before me.

Other Matters

30. Both parties identify that the proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to material planning considerations. The scheme would add four additional units to the housing supply, located on a windfall site. It would provide some economic benefits during the construction phase and after with occupants supporting the local economy. The scheme would also provide an electric vehicle charging point on site. Nevertheless, given the scale of the scheme, the benefits would be limited.
31. There is no dispute between the main parties that the accommodation proposed would be of adequate size and that there would not be any unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Even if I were to agree, a lack of harm in these respects would be a neutral consideration that would weigh neither for nor against the proposal.
32. Building works had been carried out on the site at the time of my site visit. I am told that extension works were permitted by the Council under a previous scheme and based on the evidence before me I can find no reason to disagree with the Council's views on the acceptability of the external changes to the property.

Conclusion

33. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

G Dring
INSPECTOR