



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2021

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3272810

37 Mayfield Road, South Croydon, CR2 0BG

- 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 Clayton Smith against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 20/06603/HSE, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Alterations including increasing the width of the existing crossover, formation of additional hardstanding to the front of the property and removal of the existing parking bay."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording, matching that used on the Decision Notice has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. However, as both parties have used this description in their submissions, and it is a much clearer description of the development proposed, I have used it in my heading above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on parking stress in the area and on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property with an existing off-street parking space and crossover to the front. Mayfield Road is restricted with a single yellow line on the opposite side, and a mixture of marked and unmarked on-street parking on the same side of the road as the appeal site. A single space is marked on the road to the front of the site. The attached neighbouring property has a similar arrangement to that proposed in this appeal.

Parking stress

5. Although the appellant points to the lack of an existing or proposed controlled parking zone as evidence of no parking stress in the area, on my site visit on- and off-street parking around the site and area appeared well-used. Beyond that, there is insufficient evidence before me to suggest that the loss of

the on-street space would be directly mitigated by the proposal, or that further parking stress in the area would not be caused by its loss to wider use. As such, I find that the proposal could exacerbate existing parking stress on Mayfield Road, and as such, would be contrary to policies DM29 and DM30 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, which seek to ensure that development proposals do not harm highway safety or convenience for pedestrians or other highway users.

Safety

6. Turning to highway safety, it appears that despite the presence of similar length crossovers around the site, the highway authority will not grant consent for the proposal due to concerns over sightlines, pedestrian safety and convenience as well as the cumulative length of crossovers in the immediate vicinity which pedestrians would have to negotiate.
7. In light of the lack of specific, detailed evidence to address these points, as well as the length and number of crossovers, the boundary treatments which divide them and affect visibility of the road, pavement and their users, which I saw on my site visit, I am not able to conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety for all users. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of Policies DM29 and DM30 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, which seek to ensure that development does not harm highway safety, and that movement, and in particular that of pedestrians, is not impeded by car parking.

Conclusion

8. I have some sympathy with the position of the appellant, as the area around the appeal site has a number of crossovers, parking areas and other similar arrangements to that proposed in this appeal. However, the development plan is clear in its requirements around safety, parking and associated issues. As the evidence submitted with the appeal in these regards is somewhat limited, I am not satisfied that the proposal could be implemented without giving rise to the harm identified by the Council. Although I acknowledge the potential improvements for the safety and convenience of the appellants, and that the use of the appeal site itself would not be intensified, this does not outweigh the potential for wider harm as set out above.
9. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with it.
10. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR