



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3371061

201 Valley Road, London, SW16 2XH

- 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 Mr A Malik against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application reference is Ref: 25/01002/FUL
 - The development proposed is 'Creation of a vehicle crossover with off-street parking turntable.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development as detailed on the Council's decision notice as this more accurately and succinctly describe the proposed development before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the existing on-street parking provision in the area.

Reasons

4. Valley Road is a residential street featuring on-street parking along one side, closest to the appeal site. The appeal site is enclosed by a low boundary wall along its frontage and is slightly elevated from street level. The proposal would result in the loss of one on-street parking space. The area lies within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). While I do not have specific data on parking pressure in the locality, the existence of a CPZ indicates that there is sufficient demand for parking to warrant such controls.
5. Policy Q14 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2021 (the Local Plan) states that front gardens are generally unsuitable for development. Car parking in these areas will only be allowed for Blue Badge holders where an on-street Blue Badge space cannot be provided within a reasonable distance. In such cases, proposals must demonstrate, among other things, that creating a crossover would not lead to an unacceptable loss of on-street parking spaces.

6. The appellant contends that the proposal would not reduce the overall number of parking spaces, as a space would be provided within the appeal site. However, the proposed dropped kerb would prevent other vehicles from using the existing on-street parking currently available, which would be permanently lost. This would reduce on-street parking provision and increase pressure on the remaining spaces despite there being a reduction in on street parking demand by the appellant due their having off street parking.
7. Although the appellant argues that the proposal would improve visibility for road users, including pedestrians and cyclists, there is little evidence to support this claim or to suggest that any highway safety issues currently exist.
8. The appellant also refers to other dropped kerbs along this road and to approved schemes in the wider area. However, I do not know the circumstances under which they were installed, when they were constructed, or their planning status. The example at 203 Valley Road does mean that car parking is not available for the public to the front of the entrance and this is indicated with an advisory white line. In any event, I have assessed this appeal on its own merits, with particular regard to the specific details of the scheme before me. These examples do not alter my conclusion on the main issue.
9. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on existing on-street parking provision. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policy Q14 of the Local Plan as outlined above.

Other Matters

10. The decision notice refers to two other Local Plan policies which, taken together, aim to promote a sustainable pattern of development by encouraging trips via sustainable modes and reducing reliance on private vehicles. However, as the dwelling already exists, the proposal would not increase demand for private transport or on-street parking. On this basis, while the scheme would not actively promote sustainable transport, it would not cause harm in that respect and as such is in compliance with Policy T1 in this regard.
11. Policy T6(D)(ii) states that development should avoid reliance on the public highway to meet its requirements, including for disabled users. However, the supporting text emphasises managing the availability of both on- and off-street parking, and in many areas car-free development is expected. Therefore, I am not persuaded by the appellant's argument that this policy supports the provision of off-street parking, particularly given the requirements of Policy Q14.
12. While there is no disagreement that there is a degree of compliance with London Plan Policies T3 and T6, there remains the requirement to comply with other relevant Local Plan policies.
13. I am not persuaded that by reducing on street parking provision and substituting this with a access to a private driveway it would support the objectives of the Lambeth Kerbside Strategy 2023 which seeks to transform 25% of kerbside space into places for people, and not just cars.
14. There is no dispute that the proposal would provide safe access and movement in a forward gear nor that it addresses all technical requirements for a crossover. Obtaining consent for the proposals from the Council's Highways Department does

not negate the requirement to obtain planning permission which is subject to different requirements.

15. I acknowledge that the proposal would allow the installation of an electric vehicle charging point. Nevertheless, given the modest scale of the development, this benefit does not outweigh the harm identified.
16. I have considered the appellant's need for safe and quick vehicle access due mobility and other needs of family members, and I am sympathetic to the varied needs identified. However, there is limited evidence to show that the appeal scheme is the only way to meet these needs. Moreover, the proposed development would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be relevant. For these reasons, I find this factor insufficient to outweigh the harm identified.
17. I acknowledge that there will be no direct impact on amenity and as such there is compliance with Local Plan Policy Q2 and National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in this regard. The proposed parking area would be compliance with SUDs principles, and the scheme would not result in biodiversity loss. Existing shrubs along the shared boundary would be retained, and removing the low boundary wall would not harm the character or appearance of the area due to its modest scale and is therefore in accordance with Local Plan Policy Q15. Impact on the public footpath and other public assets would be minimal. Compliance with these aspects of the development plan is a neutral factor.
18. In reaching my conclusion on this appeal, I have had regard to paragraph 116 of the Framework which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Conclusion

19. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

F P Tinsley

INSPECTOR