



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/23/3318736

595 Davidson Road, Croydon, Surrey, CR0 6DU.

- 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 Inessa Pobyeda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/05174/HSE, dated 13 December 2022 was refused by notice dated 7 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the formation of vehicular access and dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issues to be whether the proposed development would result in the loss of a parking bay and its effect on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 595 Davidson Road comprises a two-storey mid terrace house. Davidson Road is identified by the Council as a classified road.
4. The appellant proposes, following the removal of an existing disabled parking bay, the construction of a dropped kerb along with installation of permeable paving to provide on-site parking in front of the dwelling.
5. The Council found that the proposed development would not cause harm to the existing street trees in Davidson Road. Nor would it cause any harm to the character of the built environment of the area. From what I have seen and read I have not formed a contrary view on these matters.
6. Policy T4 of the London Plan (Adopted March 2021) (LP) states, along with other things that development should not increase road danger. Policy DM30 of the Croydon Local Plan (Adopted 27 February 2018) (CLP) requires car parking not to impede the movement of pedestrians or compromise highway safety.
7. As I observed, the houses on the opposite side of the road do not have off-street parking. However, the greater majority of those between numbers 587 and 635 comprising the groups of terraces of which number 595 is one dwelling

currently enjoy on-site parking. Apart from end of terrace houses none have the space to provide any degree of on-site turning, as would be the case here.

8. The result of the existing on-site parking arrangement here is that there is virtually no kerb side street parking on this side of the road. Accordingly, as I saw drivers and indeed pedestrians using the road and footpath have a relatively unobstructed view of a vehicle entering or exiting the hardstandings in front of the houses. Furthermore, if the on-street disabled parking bay were shown to be no longer required and it was agreed that it could be removed, a matter outside the scope of this appeal, I consider that highway safety would on balance be marginally improved as it would generally allow better visibility for both drivers and pedestrians.
9. However, as I saw on my site visit Davidson Road is a busy road with a significant number of traffic movements in both directions. As there would be insufficient room to turn a vehicle on site it would need to either reverse into or out of the proposed parking area across the footpath. Such manoeuvres would unacceptably hamper the free flow of traffic, which would in turn be detrimental to highway safety.
10. The application drawing illustrates just one vehicle parked centrally on the new hardstanding. However, given the proposed area and layout of the hardstanding there would be sufficient room, on occasion to park two cars on the proposed forecourt. If two cars were parked there, the proposed pedestrian visibility splays would be completely compromised, particularly for wheelchair users, pushchairs, and small children generally. This would be harmful to pedestrian safety. In addition, due to the existing lamp post, manoeuvring out of the spaces would be more difficult and would be likely to further impact on both pedestrians on the footpath and the free flow of vehicles on the road.
11. Taking all the foregoing considerations into account, I conclude, on balance, that proposed development would be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety by reason of inadequate design and layout to allow the vehicle to exit in forward gear on a busy classified road. As such the proposal would not accord with the objectives of LP Policy T4 and CLP Policies SP8 and DM29 as they require, along with other things, car parking not to impede the movement of pedestrians or compromise highway safety.

Other matters

12. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the appeal decisions referred to me by the appellant. However, I have considered this appeal on its individual merits of the context of the scheme proposal here.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR