



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3324606

Barn Elms Lodge, Queen Elizabeth Walk, Barnes, London, SW13 9SA

- 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 Magnus Boyd against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/0577/HOT, dated 3 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as "the applicant would like to extend the existing dropped kerb leading into his property. As it stands the drop kerb extent appears to stop half between his drive way from the road onto the pavement".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for "the applicant would like to extend the existing dropped kerb leading into his property. As it stands the drop kerb extent appears to stop half between his drive way from the road onto the pavement" at Barn Elms Lodge, Queen Elizabeth Walk, Barnes, London, SW13 9SA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0577/HOT, dated 3 March 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-10100-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-11100-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20100-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20101-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20201-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20202-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20203-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20204-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20301-P01; 1055-AGA-AZ-ZZ-DR-A-20302-P01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon pedestrian and highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a detached house on the corner of a junction where 5 roads intersect. The house and neighbouring property, No 1 Queen Elizabeth Walk, have off road parking accessed by adjacent gates and a shared crossover. The gates abut a relatively narrow tarmac footway. Double yellow lines prevent

on street parking outside both houses and there are traffic lights nearby at the junction.

4. The Council acknowledges that the crossover does not properly align with the gates at both houses because a separate access was added for No 1 and amendments were made to the siting of the gates. Nonetheless, they object to the extension of the dropped kerb because it would exceed the limits set out in the Council's Transport Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SPD) which gives a maximum crossover width of 3.5m with ramps of 0.6m either side.
5. Extending the dropped kerb would enable vehicles to enter and leave the appeal site more easily without having to manoeuvre around the kerb. This would improve the flow of traffic close to the junction and thus improve highway safety. In terms of compliance with the SPD, according to the plans the crossover already exceeds the 3.5m maximum width. Furthermore, the SPD only allows one vehicular access per individual property, rather than a shared access. The circumstances of the appeal site do not therefore fit within the specific provisions of the SPD. Nonetheless, the guidelines proscribing dropped kerb widths are intended to minimise their visual impact and the loss of landscaping, avoid the loss of large lengths of footway and retain kerbside parking. In this regard the proposed development meets the requirements of the SPD as there would be no reduction in kerbside parking, or landscaping features, and the loss of footway would be minor.
6. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would improve highway safety and there would be no conflict with Policy LP45 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) and the objectives of the SPD which seek to minimise the impact of car based travel on the road network and local environment.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans to provide certainty. A condition suggested by the Council regarding materials is not necessary as those required for a crossover would not be expected to match that of the house.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR