



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3362438

338 Holyhead Road, Coventry, CV5 8LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Rebecca Eises against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0000081/HHA.
 - The development proposed is A drop kerb at the front of the property to be attached to a driveway.
-

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 an end of terraced house set back behind a grass verge and footway on the A4114, Holyhead Road, which is a Classified A Road and main arterial route to and from Coventry City Centre. On the road in front of the site there is a 'no waiting at any time' parking restriction and road markings signalling the approach to a pedestrian crossing close by. On the opposite side of the road there is a bus stop. During my site visit, mid-afternoon, there was a high volume of traffic despite being outside main commuting times.
4. The proposed development is for the construction of a new dropped kerb and vehicle access on to the road. There is insufficient space on the appeal property frontage to enable a vehicle to turn in order to enter and leave the site in forward gear. Consequently, vehicles entering or leaving the property would need to reverse, potentially risking collision with oncoming traffic, particularly as the traffic lanes are too narrow to allow cars to manoeuvre around them. Vehicles turning into the site from the opposite side of the road could hinder buses approaching the nearby bus stop and potentially lead to traffic backing up towards the pedestrian crossing, impeding its use and harming pedestrian safety.
5. I note the examples of dropped kerbs close to pedestrian crossings elsewhere along Holyhead Road provided by the appellant. However, I have no evidence as to whether they were permitted before or after the introduction of pedestrian crossings. In any case, the existence of poorly located crossovers elsewhere is not in itself a good justification for permitting further unacceptable development.

6. At the time the application was refused, the council were consulting on a proposed cycleway along the side of Holyhead Road, as part of the Eastern Green sustainable urban extension. The council has confirmed that Active Travel England, the government's executive agency responsible for promoting walking and cycling, has signed off the route and construction is expected to commence in the summer of 2026. The proposed development would cross the cycleway, which is intended to separate cyclists from vehicular traffic, and thus increase the potential for accidents. It would therefore conflict with Policy AC4 of the LP which supports improved pedestrian and cycle routes.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has suggested that the proposed dropped kerb would be shared by neighbours who currently park in front of their houses and drive along the pavement to the nearest dropped kerb causing a hazard to pedestrians. Such vehicle movements are an enforcement matter and do not justify the additional harm that would arise from the proposed development.
8. The appellant raised concerns over the cycle route consultation process and suggested that the proposed development would improve drainage at the site. However, improvements to drainage would not outweigh the harm to the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic, and issues related to consultations are procedural and must remain a matter between the main parties. More particularly, my remit is limited to assessing the planning merits and impacts of the proposed development, and I have reached my decision on this basis.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR