



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 December 2019

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/19/3240267
25 Baring Road, London SE12 0JP

- 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 Nicholas Homewood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/111771, dated 20 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2019.
 - The proposed development is the construction of a vehicle crossover together with hardstanding to the front driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a vehicle crossover together with hardstanding to the front driveway to provide access and space for 2 cars to park, subject to the following conditions:
 - a) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: BR 002, dated March 2019.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of the development included in Part E of the appeal form as it more accurately describes the proposed works.
3. I observed in my site visit that the development has already been carried out and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the safety of highway users in Baring Road.

Reasons

5. The proposal is primarily to drop the kerb and build a hardstand in front of the appeal property to create a vehicle crossover that would serve two off street parking spaces in front of 25 Baring Road.
6. Baring Road is a moderately busy road within a predominately residential urban area, characterised by a mixture of semi-detached and detached properties and flatted developments. It is a two-way street with a lane of traffic in each direction and functions as one of the main links between Grove Park and the A205. The appeal site is located on the northern end of Baring Road, in close proximity to the junction with the A205. Baring Road Primary School is situated

by the junction of Baring Road with Linchmere Road, also in close proximity to the appeal site.

7. A significant number of dwellings along the street and in the vicinity of the site have off street parking and benefit from a vehicle crossover with a hardstanding. In fact, on my site visit, I was able to verify that adjoining properties on either side of 25 Baring Road benefit from vehicle crossovers with a hardstanding while also facing the same junction with Linchmere Road.
8. I was also able to confirm that other properties along Baring Road, and more directly facing what appears to be the main pedestrian entrance to Baring Road Primary School, also benefit from vehicle crossovers. Although there is appropriate pedestrian access via a footway on both sides of Baring Road, the footway on the east side, where the appeal site is located, is frequently intersected by vehicle crossovers providing access to off street parking. This seems to be a prevalent feature of the road within this particular area.
9. The road, for the reasons already described, already allows a significant amount of vehicle manoeuvring, particularly on the east side of the road. Further to this, the removal of the boundary wall between the site and the pavement will also allow for good visibility when manoeuvring in and out of the proposed parking bays.
10. Although I acknowledge that a vehicle crossover, particularly opposite a traffic junction and in proximity to a school, can pose a risk to pedestrian safety, I have not been presented with compelling evidence to demonstrate this is the case with Baring Road. In the absence of such evidence, and in light of the significant number of crossovers already in operation on this junction, the proposed additional vehicle crossover will not constitute an unacceptable impact on highway safety or severely increase cumulative impacts on the road network.
11. The Council has proposed no conditions in respect of this proposal. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I have indicated that I propose to impose a condition on the development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans.

Conclusion

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

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR