



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2022

by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/21/3284911

294 Chipstead Valley Road, Coulsdon CR5 3BE

- 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 Hayley Goertz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 21/03867/HSE, dated 21 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a dropped kerb to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on parking stress and highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace property, set back from Chipstead Valley Road behind a driveway. I note a driveway here was permitted previously¹. Similar properties exist on either side of the site, many with dropped kerbs and vehicular crossovers. On the opposite side of the road are a series of business premises, including a petrol filling station, shops and takeaways. During my site visit, a number of formal on-street parking bays along the road were in use.
4. Outside of formal parking bays, parking restrictions exist in this part of the road in the form of single-yellow lines. This prevents parking during weekdays from 1100 to 1200. Further along the street, these restrictions cover a longer period of 0700 to 1900 including weekdays and Saturdays.
5. The proposal would result in the loss of a single on-street parking. Due to the limited number of on-street parking spaces here, this would likely add to parking stress in the area, particularly for short term parking required in connection with visitors to residential properties and nearby businesses.
6. In the absence of substantive evidence of parking pressures in the area, I cannot conclude that the scheme would be acceptable. The loss of the parking space would result, albeit to a limited extent, in a reduction in communal parking provision. This may consequently lead to individuals parking

¹ Ref 17/05706/HSE.

haphazardly at certain times, which would likely be detrimental to the free flow of traffic.

7. There is little information before me regarding the detail of the driveway permitted here previously and it is unclear whether it also authorised some form of vehicular crossover. The foregoing reasoning assumes that it did. However, in the eventuality that the permitted driveway was conditional on securing the dropped kerb before me, I deal with the additional implications below.
8. The plans before me illustrate how a single car would manoeuvre in and out of the site, although two vehicles may be capable of being located immediately in front of No 294, as noted by the appellant. This appears cramped and users would need to rely on a parcel of land that lies outside the appeal site in order to both enter and exit in a forward gear. There is no indication as to ownership or agreement to use this land in this way. This arrangement is unconventional and it is highly likely that vehicles would, for convenience or lack of access to the side passage, reverse into or out of the site. This would likely impede the free flow of pedestrians and vehicles, to the detriment of highway safety in addition to the consequences of the loss of a bay described above.
9. I emphasise with the appellant's rationale for applying for permission, and accept that the removal of the on-street parking bay resulting from the scheme would allow for greater ease of entering and exiting the driveway than at present. Nevertheless, I do not agree with the appellant's position that the removal of the parking bay would improve congestion and traffic flow for the reasons outlined above. There is, moreover, no substantive evidence that the use of the existing driveway (as authorised by the Council) is a particular cause for concern in terms of highway safety.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would run contrary to the relevant provisions of Policies SP8, DM29 and DM30 of Croydon Local Plan (2018), which in summary seek to avoid prejudicing free flow of traffic or highway and pedestrian safety, and to provide sufficient parking.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and to all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Price

INSPECTOR