



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3241162

310 Bexley Road, Erith DA8 3HB

- 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 Mrs Iris Mould against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 19/01451/FUL, dated 15 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Dropped kerb outside house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity, I have taken the name of the appellant from the appeal form as it is more precise.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

4. Bexley Road is a classified 'A' road and is designated as a London Distributor Road (LDR) within the road hierarchy listed within 'saved' Policy G18 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2004 (UDP). Within the associated Design and Development Guideline 5 of the UDP (DDG), which advises that the purpose of an LDR is to provide a link between Strategic Roads. Additionally, it advises that vehicular access to LDRs not listed in Appendix A may be approved, subject to certain criteria. One criterion, is that a turning area of acceptable standard can be provided within the site. There are no details of a proposed turning area before me, and from my findings during my visit I cannot be certain that one could be provided.
5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house that already has a parking space for one vehicle, set behind a pair of low metal gates. Outside the property are double yellow lines, which also extends to the opposite side of the road. A short stay parking bay for a number of vehicles is situated a short distance away from the site, outside the commercial parade on the opposite side of the road. During my visit, I noted that a number of properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have vehicles parked to the front, many of which do

not benefit from a dropped crossing, but I also note that some properties have dropped crossings, including the house adjoining the host property.

6. The fact that this property and the other properties in the area may have dropped crossings is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development. Furthermore, I do not know the planning merits of these cases, unlike the appeal scheme which I have determined on its own planning merits. Additionally, I note the objection to the scheme, received from the Council's Transport and Development section, which in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I consider to be a material consideration of significant weight.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed dropped kerb outside the host property would significantly harm highway safety. This would be contrary to the highway safety aims of Policy CS15 of the Bexley Core Strategy 2012, UDP Policies G18, ENV39 and the DDG. It would also be contrary requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. I note that the appellant does not have a vehicle of her own and asserts that the parking space would not be used every day. I note the health issues that the appellant experiences and that she has been issued with a disabled badge, which she uses when being assisted by her family and taken to appointments, including those with the doctor and hospital. However, whilst I have sympathy for the appellant, regarding her health, in this instance, I do not find this to outweigh the potential significant harm to highway safety as a direct consequence of the proposed development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

9. Taking all relevant matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR