



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/24/3357085

127 Waddon Road, Croydon CR0 4JL

- 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 Mohammad Hassan Ally against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/02311/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as: a drop Kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The site features a garden adjoining the highway. Several vehicular accesses adjoin this section of the highway in addition to on-street parking within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). There is a junction directly opposite the appeal site and a second on the same side of the highway as the proposal. A bus stop directly opposite the site results in pedestrians crossing the road and congregating on the pavement within the vicinity. Vehicles and pedestrians travel along this section of highway to access services along Purley Way.
4. The configuration of the proposal would necessitate vehicles crossing the public footway resulting in potential conflict with pedestrians accessing Purley Way or the bus stop opposite. Owing to the size of the parking area vehicles could not enter and exit the site in forward gear. Irrespective of nearby boundary treatments, the presence of nearby parked cars would diminish visibility for a motorist reversing a vehicle. This would create potential conflict with passing motorists. This conflict with vehicles would be further exacerbated by the proposal's proximity to the two junctions and frequency of vehicles within the vicinity crossing the highway when entering or exiting Waddon Road.
5. Whilst vehicle speeds along this section of highway are relatively low, this would not prevent the conflict with pedestrians and road users owing to a lack of visibility, representing an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
6. The gain in a single off-street parking space is limited by the fact it would only be available for use by occupants of the site, rather than for public use. Further, the

proposal would necessitate the removal of on-street parking spaces within the CPZ. As such, the proposed development would decrease the supply of off-street parking, contributing to the existing parking stress of the area. This would therefore result in additional vehicles slowing, stopping, and starting within the highway when finding a parking space, interrupting traffic flows and highway efficiency.

7. There are several vehicular accesses along this section of Waddon Road, which the appellant has suggested were permitted between 2004 to 2006. Whilst this may be the case, the current scheme would result in an increase of the number of entry points to the highway and would increase the conflict between different vehicles and pedestrians. The presence of private vehicular accesses adjoining the highway do not justify the harm the proposal would cause to highway safety.
8. The appellant indicates that the proposal will improve sightlines along the road through the removal of two on-street parking spaces. Nevertheless, as these are situated between existing off-street parking spaces, any improvement to visibility along the highway would be limited.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would have an unacceptable and detrimental effect on highway safety. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with the relevant provisions of Policy T4 of The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) and Policies DM29 and DM30 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018). When read together these policies require new development to not increase road danger nor have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

10. Whilst the proposal is located close to local services, this does not justify the above identified harm to highway safety.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would conflict with the Development Plan, when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the preceding reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR