



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2025

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/25/3361899

289 Woodham Lane, Addlestone, Surrey, KT15 3NX

- 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 Mr Nawaz against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.24/1713.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed drop kerb off Woodham Road'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development on the application form refers to a 'proposed drop kerb off Woodham Road'. However, all other documentation, including the site address and site location plan refer to the site address as being 289 Woodham Lane and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, located at the junction of Woodham Lane and Lindsey Road. This stretch of Woodham Lane is subject to a 30mph speed limit and there are double yellow lines to the front and side of the dwelling. The frontage of the dwelling is paved and appears to be used for parking, without the benefit of a dropped kerb. The frontage of the dwelling is enclosed by a wall well in excess of 1m in height which also extends along the side boundary with 287 Woodham Lane.
5. The County Highway Authority (CHA) advise that a new access at this location would require visibility splays of 2.4m by 43m. The CHA stipulate that they can only accept visibility splays located on land either under the control of the applicant, or land classified as public highway.
6. The appellant has provided a drawing with the appeal submission indicating visibility splays. However, the Council and other consultees have not had the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the information provided on this drawing or the suitability of the visibility splays shown which appear to fall short of those requested by the Highway Authority. From my observations on site, I cannot be

sure that visibility sightlines necessary to ensure both pedestrian and vehicular safety can be provided within highway land or land controlled by the appellant. Rather, visibility is likely to be restricted by existing boundary enclosures to front of the appeal property and on adjacent land.

7. The site is located on a busy stretch of Woodham Lane due to the adjacent shopping parades. During my site visit I observed that parking bays adjacent to the shops and commercial units opposite the site were in constant use and I also observed a high incident of vehicles parking on double yellow lines, including those adjacent to the appeal property. The pavement was also in frequent use by pedestrians.
8. In the absence of sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the required visibility splays can be provided on land under the appellant's control or on the public highway, given the busy nature of the surrounding roads and footways, I find the formation of the access facilitated by the dropped kerb would be likely to lead result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety, particularly when vehicles are egressing the parking space.
9. I acknowledge that the frontage is already used for parking however, this does not justify the provision of a dropped kerb and the formalisation of the access. I also consider it unlikely that the proposal would result in a significant reduction in the incidence of vehicles parking on double yellow lines as suggested by interested parties. Whilst other dwellings along Woodham Lane have dropped kerbs, each proposal must be considered on its own merits.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety. It would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policy SD4 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020) and LTP4 of the Surrey Local Transport Plan. Collectively these policies seek to ensure that a safe and suitable access can be achieved and that development proposals maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network and take account of the needs of all highway users for safe access and egress.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR