



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/W/23/3324720

18 High Street, Nutfield, Surrey, RH1 4HQ

- 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 Tony Gerrard against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2023/2, dated 2 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is formation of a vehicular crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

Reasons

3. The front of properties 18-22 are hardsurfaced and are used for parking parallel to the houses. There is a dropped kerb outside 20-22 which provides access from the highway to these spaces. The submitted tracked path drawings show that the existing width of the dropped kerb would allow a single large car to park and enter and exit the site without multiple manoeuvres across the pavement. However, I understand that in practice the occupiers 'bump over' the kerb to allow more cars to park on this land.
4. The tracked path drawings show that the proposed development would enable two cars to park outside these properties and enter and exit the site without multiple movements across the pavement. However, I am not presented with any mechanism to control the number or location of vehicles that could park in this area. In addition, the drawings only show the vehicles entering and leaving in a easterly direction. Consequently, even considering that 20-22 is currently owned by the appellant, based on the evidence before me, a scenario when turning or parking would occur across the pavement and highway is likely to occur. This would lead to increased conflict between road users and those parking at this site, leading to an increased risk to pedestrians and drivers, and harm to highway safety as a result.
5. Parking multiple cars on this land occurs at present, and the submitted accident data indicates that there have not been any accidents as a result. Whilst the proposals would stop cars from crossing the pavement where there is no dropped kerb, the installation of a dropped kerb would make additional parking

more simple and attractive and therefore the frequency of conflict and potential for accidents would increase.

6. Data from 2014 demonstrates that there would be few adequate gaps in traffic flow to allow for manoeuvres onto or off this site. Although this is somewhat dated, there is no reason presented to me that traffic in this area would have reduced and I am not provided with detailed contradictory evidence. As such, for the reasons above, cars entering and exiting the appeal site are likely to disrupt the free flow of traffic. I am not provided with any substantive evidence that traffic calming is required in this area and as such any consequential effect of traffic stopping or slowing to allow vehicles to enter or leave these spaces would not be a benefit in this regard.
7. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to highway safety and the free flow of traffic. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy DP5 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014) which, in part, requires that development must not unnecessarily impede the free flow of traffic or create hazards to road users. As well as the advice in objective 3 of the Surrey Transport Plan 2011-2026 which seeks to improve road safety and the security of the travelling public in Surrey.
8. Policy CSP12 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy DPD (2008) mainly relates to managing travel demand, therefore the policies set out above are more relevant to this main issue.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR