



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by A James BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 NOVEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/25/3370069

245 Parchmore Road, Thornton Heath, Croydon, CR7 8HH

- 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 Quadri Otolorin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01199/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as the formation of vehicular access and removal of front boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Evidence has been submitted which demonstrates that both parties agreed to change the description of proposed works to "Formation of vehicular access and removal of front boundary wall". This is the basis for which I have considered this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety and efficiency.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located along Parchmore Road which is a classified road. There is predominantly on street parking here with some private driveways. Neither party has made reference to specific parking controls in the area, but the Council have noted it is an area of high traffic.
5. The appeal site principally comprises of hardstanding at the front of 245 Parchmore Road. While there is no dropped kerb or dropped pavement here, I could see from my site visit and from evidence provided that cars were parked on the hardstanding. It is proposed that the kerb and pavement are dropped to form a vehicular access. It is also proposed to remove the existing front boundary wall.
6. The Council have raised that the proposed vehicular access onto Parchmore Road would be poorly sited and designed and would be unable to achieve satisfactory pedestrian visibility splays. It would also not be possible for vehicles to turn within the site and exit in a forward gear. Reversing onto a highly trafficked road here has the potential to cause disruption and a risk to highway safety. The appellant has provided a swept path analysis, and this demonstrates that two cars can manoeuvre from Parchmore Road on to the driveway. Sight lines have also been provided on the proposed site layout. However, these are not drawn within the

boundary of the site. Therefore, the sight lines do not consider the boundary treatments either side of 245 Parchmore Road.

7. From my site visit, it would appear that both boundary treatments would likely block the view of the driver when leaving the driveway to egress onto the crossover. As a result, it is likely that drivers would not be able to clearly see pedestrians when they first leave the hardstanding. Consequently, it has not been demonstrated that safe pedestrian visibility can be achieved, and the movement of pedestrians would not be impeded.
8. This concern is further compounded by the high frequency of pedestrians on Parchmore Road observed during my site visit. I am mindful, that this was only a snapshot in time. However, given the proximity to St James The Great Roman Catholic Primary and Nursery School, it is likely that there would be a higher frequency of pedestrians who would be at risk from vehicles egressing onto the crossover at certain times of the day.
9. The appellant has indicated that pedestrian visibility splays could be dealt with by condition. However, even were I to accept that a condition could satisfactorily deal with this issue, I have no evidence before me to demonstrate that this could realistically be achieved within the appeal site. On this basis, such a condition would fail the tests of reasonableness and enforceability.
10. The appellant has indicated that there are many other examples of permitted vehicular accesses without forward-gear exit capability. However, I have limited details before me, including the planning context at those other site, that would enable me to draw direct comparisons between them and the appeal proposal. Ultimately, I have considered this appeal, including its relationship with the highway, on its own individual circumstances.
11. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on highway safety, contrary to the relevant provision of Policies SP8, DM29 and DM30 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and Policies T3, T4 and T6.1 of the London Plan. These policies in summary seek to ensure highway safety standards are met through design.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has raised that a fallback position has been created by a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC), under reference 24/03828/LE, which was granted for the formation of vehicular access and removal of front boundary wall.
13. I do not have the full details before me and therefore, I cannot be certain of the extent of the development which was granted under 24/03828/LE. Thus, the fallback position attracts limited weight in this decision and does not overcome or outweigh the harmful impact I have found with regards to highway safety.
14. I acknowledge the appellant's reference to a lack of harm in respect of character and appearance, heritage, flood risk, drainage and fire safety. Nevertheless, there is no dispute between the parties on these matters and I have no reason to disagree. The lack of harm in these respects is effectively neutral in my determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

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

A James

INSPECTOR