
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2016

by Rory Cridland LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E1210/W/16/3150993

94 Ringwood Road, Walkford, Christchurch BH23 5RF

- 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 Ms Diane Burton against the decision of Christchurch Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 8/16/0003, dated 4 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "form/extend dropped kerb onto Ringwood Road to form safer entry onto the road from driveway."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms Diane Burton against Christchurch Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Ringwood Road, a busy road which passes through the settlement of Walkford. It is situated close to a pedestrian crossing and currently benefits from a drop kerb and vehicle cross over adjacent to the north western boundary. This provides access to the rear of the site, via large electric gates, which consists of a tarmacked drive with parking and turning area. It also provides access to the front of the property which consists of additional parking alongside the adjacent footway. There is a second drop kerb close to the south eastern boundary which provides access the neighbouring property, No 92.
 5. The proposal would join together the two existing drop kerbs by removing the raised area between them, creating a single drop kerb along the entire length of the application site. The Council is concerned that this would increase the likelihood of vehicles reversing onto the highway. I agree with those concerns. As the appellant's evidence shows, at present it is possible for a single vehicle to undertake a turning manoeuvre and exit the site in forward gear. However, the proposal would enable a greater number of vehicles to be parked on the site. In view of the site's dimensions, there is every likelihood that drivers
-

would park at right angles to the building preventing them from exiting the site in forward gear and resulting in them reversing directly onto the highway. Furthermore, in view of its considerable length, the proposal would significantly increase the potential for pedestrians to come into conflict with vehicles exiting these areas, materially impacting on pedestrian safety

6. While I note the appellant's assertions that any vehicles using the parking at the front could make use of the turning area to the rear, its access is restricted and there is nothing to guarantee its availability for that purpose. In addition, in the event that more than one vehicle was parked there, exiting the site in this way could require complex manoeuvres by multiple vehicles, increasing the potential for conflict between pedestrians and drivers.
7. Moreover, I note the Council's accident data which shows that pedestrians and vehicles have previously come into conflict along Ringwood Road. Although these incidents took place further along the road, it indicates that there are already pedestrian safety issues which I consider would be compounded by the proposed development and its proximity to the pedestrian crossing.
8. While I note the visibility benefits when exiting the site in forward gear and that the appellant's purpose is to improve road safety when entering the site, these do not outweigh the serious detriment to highway safety I have identified above.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposal would have an adverse impact on highway safety and as such would be contrary to Policy KS11 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Core Strategy. This policy, amongst other things, requires new development to provide safe access on to the existing transport network.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory Cridland

INSPECTOR