



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2023 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3323798

221 Pickhurst Lane, Bromley, West Wickham BR4 0HJ

- 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 Chris Davis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/23/00327/FULL6, dated 26 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed drop kerb and block paved driveway.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is on a corner plot, at the junction of Pickhurst Lane and Wickham Chase with a small front garden adjoining both. Pickhurst Lane is busy and whilst my site visit represents a snapshot in time, this broadly reflects the conditions described by the Council. The proposal would facilitate the use of the front garden as a parking space, with a dropped kerb providing vehicular access onto Pickhurst Lane. It would result in vehicles passing over the footway.
5. I have not been provided with compelling evidence to demonstrate that the size and shape of the proposed parking area would permit the average modern vehicle from entering and exiting the site in forward gear. Reversing into the site would lead to vehicles slowing, stopping, and turning off the busy road in reverse. This would unacceptably impede the free flow of traffic. In addition, reversing out of the site into the road, a situation where the driver's visibility would be limited, would be hazardous to both pedestrians and other road users.
6. I have not been shown details of visibility splays which may indicate that sufficient sightlines could be achieved when leaving the site in forward gear. Nor have I been presented with records indicating a lack of incidents involving

vehicular movements within the area. Whilst vehicle speeds and movements to and from the appeal site via the proposed access would likely be commensurate with its residential nature, the above circumstances would still unacceptably increase the likelihood of conflict with pedestrians and motorists.

7. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. In this regard, it would conflict with Policies 32 and 34 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 which broadly require new developments to, amongst other things, ensure road safety is not significantly adversely affected.

Other Matters

8. There is an extant planning permission¹ for the addition of an annexe to a detached garage in the rear garden. The latter of which already has vehicular access. Wickham Chase does not have on street parking restrictions. In addition, existing access and off street parking would seem to already provide for such to respond to the needs of both the dwelling and the annexe. It also strikes me that it could accommodate the installation of an electrical vehicle charging point. The position of the garage and its proximity to the back edge of the highway would still no doubt involve a reversing manoeuvre to get on and/or off the property, but this would be onto a minor secondary road in the shape of Wickham Chase. It is also an existing situation over which the consideration of this scheme has no specific control.
9. I have not been made aware of the full circumstances of other examples of similar parking arrangements along Pickhurst Lane. It is unclear whether they benefit from express planning permission. In any event, their presence does not justify the harm that would arise as it has been identified.
10. I note the appellant's concerns regarding a lack of communication from the Council. However, this is a procedural matter which does not have a bearing on the outcome of the appeal with specific regard to the merits of the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight which would indicate to the contrary. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Council Reference 22/03436/FULL6