



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/22/3300545

50 Erith Road, Belvedere DA17 6EY

- 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 Amardip Nijjar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/03318/FUL, dated 26 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house. It forms part of a group of 4 largely identical houses with hardstanding at the front and off-street parking to the rear.
4. Erith Road, is a London Distributor Road (LDR), as classified by Policy G18 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004 (UDP) which seeks to manage the borough's roads according to their function. The Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines (DCG) set out at Section 5 that, other than Strategic Roads, LDRs are the most important traffic roads where limited access may be approved in certain circumstances. These include where adequate sightlines and turning areas within properties can be provided, and where crossovers would not create a hazard likely to lead to an accident.
5. In front of the appeal property there is the road junction between Erith Road and Brook Street and close to this there is a pedestrian crossing point with a central reservation. The two roads are relatively busy and there is a regular flow of vehicles turning into and out of Brook Street.
6. The appeal proposal would comprise works to the front boundary of the property and within the pavement to enable the area of hardstanding at the front of the house to be used for off-street parking. The information provided with the application does not demonstrate that the area of hardstanding would be of sufficient size to enable cars to enter and leave the appeal site in forward

gear. Even if this is the case, I note that entering the site from the east or leaving to go in a westerly direction would require cars to manoeuvre within the section of Erith Road used by vehicles turning into Brook Street. This situation would cause potential confusion and unacceptable road traffic conflict close to the pedestrian crossing.

7. Due to the appeal site's close vicinity to a busy road junction and a pedestrian crossing point I therefore conclude that vehicles entering and leaving the site would have an unacceptable effect on highway and pedestrian safety. Consequentially the proposal fails to accord with UDP Policy G18 and Policies CS03 and CS15 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012) which, amongst other things, stress the need for a safe highway network. There is also conflict with the aims of Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021) and the DCG.
8. I note that many nearby properties benefit from crossovers. However, these properties are not directly comparable to the appeal property in respect of the size of their parking areas and their relationship to road junctions and pedestrian crossings. As each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits, I attribute limited weight to the existing nearby vehicular crossovers.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR