



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2024

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09.04.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D3125/D/24/3336568

Lower Turnpike Cottage, Rayford Lane, Bartongate, Oxfordshire, OX7 7DD

- 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 Jack Bryant against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02575/HHD, dated 25 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of new frontage hardstanding and vehicular crossover (drop kerb) and associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached house on the corner of Rayford Lane where it joins the B4030, close to another road junction on the opposite side of the road where Duns Tew Road joins the B4030. Rayford Lane continues past the appeal site providing access to several houses on the same side of the lane. Some cars park in lay-bys on the opposite side of the track and other houses have off street parking. There is no turning space where the lane ends and connects to a public footpath.
4. The junction is on a slight bend in the road and visibility from Rayford Lane onto the B4030 is poor in both directions, but particularly to the right where the position of the appeal property and adjoining house, and a curve in the road, obscure views of oncoming traffic. A wider visibility splay to the left provides better views of traffic approaching from that side, but part of the splay is used for off street parking, and it is inferred in the appellant's statement of case that this is where he currently parks. Mirrors are installed to enable vehicles leaving Rayford Lane to see further along the A4030, but it remains a difficult junction to enter and leave.
5. The appeal property's front garden comprises gravel, a stone slab front path and hedge and shrubs in front of low wooden fences along its side boundaries. The fence along the boundary with the adjoining house tapers in so that the garden is slightly narrower away from the house. A grass verge drops down to the Lane and a telegraph pole on the verge sits in front of the appeal site. The

proposed development would involve relocating the telegraph pole and placing a hardstanding for off road parking in front of the house and a dropped kerb where the verge meets the lane.

6. Policy T4 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (2018) (LP) requires development to meet Oxfordshire County Council's adopted parking standards, part of which are set out in the Council's dropped kerb guidelines (DKG). The DKG does not allow crossings within 15m of a road junction, or which do not provide parking that allows 1.2m width access to and from the front door to enable emergency services access. As noted in an objection by the Local Highways Authority, the proposal does not meet either of these guidelines and therefore conflicts with Policy T4. Furthermore, the appellant acknowledges that to meet the DKG parking length requirements, the parking area would need to extend beyond the appeal site curtilage on to the grass verge in front of it.
7. Bends in the road cause traffic to slow down when approaching the site from either direction along the A4030. Personal Injury Collisions data provided by the appellant identified only one accident close to the junction between 2017 and 2021, which suggests that under the current parking arrangements the area is not an accident hotspot. However, manoeuvring in and out of the proposed parking space would involve reversing across the entrance to the lane, right on the junction. This would cause conflict with any vehicles turning into the lane from either direction requiring them to stop on the A4030 where visibility for approaching traffic is poor. Despite low traffic movements in and out of the lane there would be an unacceptable reduction in highway safety.
8. I note that the proposed development would not increase traffic and that it would remove a vehicle from parking on the road. However, existing parking at the junction, whilst not ideal, is visible from the B4030 in both directions, which the appeal site is not. Therefore, vehicle movements are more visible and driver's intentions more obvious than would be the case for vehicles entering and leaving the appeal site. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would conflict with Policies OS2, T2 and T4 of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework) which require development to provide safe vehicular access and suitable parking which does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matter

9. The proposal includes the installation of an electric vehicle charging station which would lead to carbon reductions and align with the Frameworks objectives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Whilst I accord such benefits significant weight, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified, and the conflict with the LP policies.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR