



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2023

by Nick Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/D/23/3320408

222 London Road, Brandon, Suffolk IP27 0LP

- 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 Jamie Parnham against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/1755/HH, dated 11 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a drop kerb from A1065 London Road onto a driveway constructed on the front garden of 222 London Road Brandon Suffolk.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant and Council refer to part of the development as a drop, or dropped, kerb. I consider this to be more accurately described as the formation of a vehicular access given that the dropped kerb in question forms part of the public highway and is outside the application site. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed vehicular access on highway safety with particular regard to the proximity of a controlled pedestrian crossing.

Reasons

4. The site addresses London Road, the A1065. The proposed vehicular access would be located on the zig-zag markings on the approach to the pedestrian crossing.
5. Vehicles exiting the site and making a left turn would immediately reach the stop line for the pedestrian crossing. This would not leave the zig-zag area clear and could cause conflict with pedestrians using and waiting at the crossing to the detriment of highway safety.
6. I have considered the appellant's submissions regarding other similar relationships between vehicular accesses and pedestrian crossings or junctions and indeed, a comparable access on the opposing side of London Road. However, I do not have any detail of the origins of these accesses including whether they were created before or after the road features. Nor do I have any information on the policy and guidance framework at the time of their formation. This proposal can only be determined in relation to current policy and guidance which makes it clear that highway safety must be maintained. In particular, zig-zag controlled areas must be kept clear. The existence of other

existing substandard arrangements does not justify a further erosion of highway safety.

7. The development poses an unacceptable risk to highway safety and is therefore contrary to the requirements of policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Bowden

INSPECTOR