



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3343541

81 Selsdon Road, South Croydon, CR2 6PZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sajawal Khan against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/00425/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as formation of vehicular crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of vehicular crossover at 81 Selsdon Road, South Croydon, CR2 6PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00425/HSE and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: 1:1250 OS plan and vehicle crossover & visibility plan dated 23 February 2024.
 - 3) No obstructions over 0.6 metres in height shall be placed within the visibility splays and any boundary treatments and/or landscaping shall be maintained at a maximum height of 0.6 metres within such splays, such splays shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on vehicular and pedestrian highway safety.

Reasons

3. Selsden Road is primarily characterised by traditional residential terraces and semi-detached dwellings that are set back from the highway behind modest sized front gardens. Many of these front gardens include on-site parking facilities, which do not benefit from on-site turning facilities. The majority of these on-site parking spaces are accessed via vehicular crossovers.
4. Selsden Road is a busy B classified road which is subject to a 30mph speed limit. On street parking is not allowed on one side of the road and is not allowed between the hours of 7am and 7pm on the other side of the road. On

- street parking is further restricted by the on-site parking spaces and associated crossovers. There are a variety of on-street parking restrictions in the adjacent roads, where many of the properties do not have on-site parking facilities.
5. The appeal property's front garden is hard surfaced and at the time of the appeal site visit was being used for parking. There is no crossover the front of the on-site parking area, although there are crossovers to the front of the adjacent dwellings and many of the nearby properties.
 6. Together and amongst other things Policy T4 of the London Plan and policy DM29 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (LP) state that proposals should not have a detrimental impact on highway safety. LP Policy DM30 states that development should ensure that the provision of parking does not compromise the movement of pedestrians, cyclist, public transport and emergency vehicles. Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework), states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
 7. The Council's Vehicle Crossover Guidelines (VCG) states that the highway authority will have regard to the safety and convenience of other highway users and the standards required for the provision of crossovers. It recommends that for classified roads crossovers will only be approved if on-site turning facilities are provided. This is because classified roads are heavily trafficked, support cycle and bus routes and are prone to heavy pedestrian movement. The VCG also sets out pedestrian and vehicular visibility requirements and states that crossovers should not be located within 10 metres of a road junction. Whilst this guidance is not prescriptive it is relevant to highway safety and the convenience of other road users and weighs against the proposal.
 8. The proposed crossover would be sited along a straight section of highway, where the pavement is in excess of 1.5 metres deep. It would also be sited more than 10 metres from the junction of Selsden Road and Junction Road. The appeal dwelling is located within a row of semi-detached dwellings where most of the dwellings have on-site parking within their front gardens and associated vehicular crossovers. These crossovers and parking areas are clearly visible from the adjacent pavement and carriageways and most of the parking areas have good pedestrian and vehicular visibility. The proposed parking area would provide acceptable pedestrian and vehicular visibility splays and in this respect the council has raised no concerns.
 9. I note that there is a road sign within the pavement to the front of the appeal property and within the pedestrian visibility splay. However, it is not unusual for such signs to be located within visibility splays and in this instance there would be clear views on both sides of the slimline road sign columns. As such, the proposal would not result in a need for the road sign to be moved.
 10. The above factors weigh in favour of the proposal. As stated in the council's highway teams consultation reply, it will be up to the planning balance in regards to other existing dropped kerbs in the area as to whether the proposal is acceptable. Further by providing on-site parking the scheme would reduce the pressure for on-site parking within the local area. This would help reduce the pressure for on-street parking spaces and associated congestion within the local road network.

11. In this instance I find that the merits of the proposal, including the widespread provision of on-site parking and crossovers within this part of Selsden Road, clearly outweigh the absence of on-site turning and the associated conflict with the VCG. This is subject to the imposition of conditions which require the retention of the pedestrian visibility splays and adherence to the submitted drawings. These conditions are necessary in the interests of highway safety and certainty.
12. The council has also suggested the imposition of a condition which requires the development to be constructed from materials which match the host building. As the proposal relates solely to a vehicular crossover it would appear that this condition was suggested in error.
12. I conclude that the proposal would not have a material impact on highway safety and would comply with LP Policy DM30, policy T4 of the London Plan, Paragraph 115 of the Framework and the objectives of the VCG.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR