



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2023

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/22/3305822

98 Hook Road, Epsom, Surrey KT19 8TR

- 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 R Mayson against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00357/FLH, dated 16 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the formation of vehicular access and crossover (involving dropped kerb).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a dwelling which fronts onto Hook Road. To the front of the dwelling a small frontage exists which is laid to hardstanding. The Council confirm that Hook Road is a classified road also known as the B284.
4. While a snapshot in time, during my site visit I found this section of Hook Road to be well trafficked. Breaks in the traffic were occasional and visibility was limited by existing parked vehicles on the highway.
5. The frontage to 98 Hook Road would be constrained in size. The appeal is also not supported by compelling evidence to show how the frontage would meet parking standards particularly demonstrating that a family sized vehicle could enter or leave the site safely.
6. While other dwellings benefit from frontage crossovers, I have not been provided with evidence setting out how these were found to be acceptable. Additionally, some existing crossovers elsewhere may have historically not required planning permission.
7. However, each case must be considered on its own merits in the light of the specific circumstances and context of each case cumulatively at that point in time. Overall, I am not persuaded that the presence of vehicle crossovers elsewhere justifies the proposal before me.
8. I cannot therefore be satisfied that the appeal would not compromise highway safety either to pedestrians or other road users. The proposed development

would therefore conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy DM 35 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Development Management Policies 2015, Policy CS16 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Core Strategy 2007, the Parking Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework. All of which, amongst other things, seek to ensure proposals would not be prejudicial to highway safety.

9. I have not been provided with details of Objective 3 of the Surrey Transport Plan 2022-2032 beyond its aims to provide well connected communities that encourage social mobility and ensure no-one is left behind. Given my findings above, I also conclude that the proposed development has not shown that it would provide a well connected community.

Conclusion

10. As such, the proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR