



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/19/3244184

59 Coulsdon Road, Coulsdon CR5 2LD

- 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 Miss Jo Martin against the decision of the London borough of Croydon Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04252/HSE, dated 8 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is drop kerb outside property to give proper access to double driveway in front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dropped kerb outside property to give proper access to double driveway in front of property at 59 Coulsdon Road, Coulsdon, CR5 2LD, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/04252/HSE, dated 8 September 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Site Location Plan.
 - 3) No development shall take place until a plan showing the parking spaces on site measuring 4.8 metres in depth has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The spaces shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the commencement of the development hereby permitted.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey terraced property located on the eastern side of Coulsdon Road, opposite the junction with Stanley Close with two existing parking spaces which lie at the front. The terrace of properties
-

that the appeal dwelling forms part of are set back from the highway and feature long narrow front gardens with most having areas of hardstanding adjoining the pavement. On my site visit I observed that several neighbouring properties forming part of the terrace had existing dropped kerbs.

5. The proposed dropped kerb would be formed across the full width of the appeal property's front hardstanding area and would provide ready access to the existing parking spaces. These spaces are shown in the appellant's evidence as measuring 4.51m deep, which is less than the 4.8m required by the Council's Suburban Design Guide (2019). However, it is clear that there is sufficient room within the front garden behind to enable parking spaces 4.8m deep to be created. The provision of a plan showing this, and the provision of such spaces before the dropped kerb is completed, can be secured by condition.
6. Though I note the appellant's current vehicle does not currently overhang the pavement when parked on the site, that appears to be because it overhangs the low retaining wall which separates the parking space from the front garden. Not all vehicles may be able to do this and so deeper parking spaces would ensure that most vehicles would not overhang the highway.
7. The Council also expressed concern with regards to the proposal extending the existing crossover from 61 to 65 Coulsdon Road. However, I do not consider that the extension of the crossover would necessarily compromise pedestrian safety in this location as the pavement is wide and visibility between the parking spaces and the pavement is good.
8. Therefore, with slightly deeper parking spaces, the proposal would not lead to vehicles unacceptably obstructing and overhanging the footway and would not adversely impact the movement of pedestrians or compromise highway safety.
9. In light of the foregoing, I find the proposal would not harm highway safety and would not conflict with policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which seeks to ensure off-street parking or vehicles parked within forecourts do not encroach on the public highway, as well as Policy DM30 which seeks to ensure highway safety and the movement of pedestrians is not compromised by the provision of off-street parking. With the provision of deeper spaces, the proposal would also adhere to the guidelines set out in the Suburban Design Guide as set out above.

Conditions

10. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plan in order to provide certainty. I have also, as discussed above, included a condition requiring the submission of an additional plan showing deeper parking spaces and that these spaces are provided prior to the dropped kerb being provided. This is necessary in the interests of highway safety.

Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR