



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by Peter Mark Sturgess BSc (Hons), MBA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday, 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/20/3253742

17 Alton Road, Croydon, CR0 4LZ

- 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 Mr Usman Naeem against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/01481/FUL, dated 30 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion of single dwellinghouse to 1 x 3 bedroom flat, 1x 1bedroom flat and 1 x studio flat, alterations, demolition, erection of a single storey and rear extension and associated landscaping, 1 car parking space, refuse and cycle store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the parking that would be generated by the proposed development on the efficient operation and safety of the local highway network.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single dwelling fronting on to Alton Road with a vehicular access on to Waddon Road to the rear. At present there is one car parking space on site and a vehicular cross over on to Waddon Road. Waddon Road and Alton Road are relatively narrow with parking on either side.
4. The Council and objectors to the proposal have referred to parking stress being experienced in the area. I noted at my site visit that on street parking was prevalent in the area and there were few vacant spaces available at the time of my visit, which was during the working day. I also noted signs in windows asking people not to park across drives. It is clear to me that there would be fewer, if any, spaces available in the evening when more residents would be at home.
5. Furthermore, the area has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3 which is moderate, despite this being questioned by the appellant. In areas such as this it is more likely that people will have to rely on private cars for their everyday needs than in areas with a higher PTAL score, where there is better access to public transport.

6. I am satisfied that on the basis of the evidence supplied by the Council and the people living in the area, the areas PTAL assessment and observations at my site visit that the area around the appeal site is subject to parking stress.
7. The appeal proposal would turn an existing single dwelling into three dwellings and retain the single parking space on site. This would inevitably add to the parking stress experienced in the area as the three proposed dwellings would generate a greater need for on street parking spaces than the existing single dwelling.
8. The appellant has made reference to the parking standards referred to in the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (CLP) and the London Plan 2016 (LP). He has argued that in terms of the maximum parking standards for such a development this should be at the most 1.5 spaces for the 3-bedroom unit and for 1 or 2 bed units less than 0.5 for each of the units.
9. On this calculation the maximum number of spaces required by the standards for the proposed development would be around 2.5. This is significantly more than the 1 space which is proposed to be provided within the appeal proposal. On the basis of this calculation the development would add to the number of residents cars parking on the street. Consequently, this would increase the impact of car parking in this area, which evidence has shown is an area of existing car parking stress.
10. Moreover, due to the width and the configuration of the roads and the prevalence of existing on street parking, additional demand for on street parking created by the appeal proposal would harm highway safety in the area. This harm would manifest itself through an increase difficulty in emergency and other large vehicles accessing the area, due to the significantly narrowed carriageway brought about by on street parking, especially at times of peak demand. It would also increase the danger for pedestrians when crossing the street, as visibility is likely to be reduced by parked cars. The likely low speeds of the traffic in the area would be unlikely to mitigate the harm identified to any significant degree due to this decreased visibility.
11. For these reasons the proposed development would increase the demand for on street parking in an area that is already subject to parking stress and be harmful to the safety and efficient operation of the existing highway network. As a result, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy DM30 of the CLP which seeks, amongst other things, to reduce the impact of car parking in areas of existing on-street parking stress. It would also be in conflict with Policy DM29 of the CLP which seeks amongst other things to ensure that development has a positive impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has argued that the appeal proposal would add to the quantity and mix of housing types in the area. Whilst I have had regard to this argument, I find that it is not sufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the safety and efficiency of the highway network by the appeal proposal to which I attach significant weight.
13. I have had regard to the previous planning application referred to by the appellant. That application is materially different to the proposal which is before me as it proposed 2 on-site parking spaces. I have therefore determined

this appeal on the basis that it provides 1 parking space within the appeal site and I have set out above how having to accommodate at least one additional car in the streets causes harm to the safety and efficiency of the highway network in the area.

14. The appellant has referred to the possibility of the residents of the proposed development being prevented from obtaining a residents parking permit within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in either Waddon Road or Alton Road through the use of a planning condition.
15. There is currently no CPZ in either of these roads. Therefore, and in the absence of such a scheme, a condition as suggested would not prevent the harm caused by the additional parking brought about by the appeal proposal. It would therefore not be relevant to the proposal and would not meet the tests for conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not be relevant to the development as the site lies outside a CPZ.
16. I have also had regard to the appellant's offer to pay for the residents of the two smaller flats to be members of a car club and the offer to make any residents aware of the parking situation in the area. As there is no mechanism to achieve this, I can give this proposal little weight in this decision.
17. The appellant has argued that the impact of the appeal proposal would be little different in terms of the amount of car parking required to that of the existing 5-bedroom house. I disagree, the existing 5-bedroom house would be occupied by one household and might be expected to have 1/2 cars associated with it. The appeal proposal on the other hand would provide accommodation for 3 households and might be expected to 4/5 cars associated with the proposed dwellings. Therefore, significantly more cars are capable of being generated by the appeal proposal than the existing house.
18. I acknowledge that there are some services within walking distance of the appeal site. However, the appeal site is in an area with a moderate PTAL rating of 3 where it would be expected that residents would have to rely on a private car for some or all of their requirements. Therefore, whilst some needs could be met locally, overall, in this location there would be a need for residents to rely on the private cars thereby adding to the parking stress in the area.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Peter Mark Sturgess

INSPECTOR