



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3366526

21 Meadowview Road, Bexley, DA5 1HP

- 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 and Mrs Foxhall-Ridgeway against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 25/00505/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for the formation of a vehicular crossover and hard standing along with alterations to front boundary walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The site is situated in a residential area and the road is characterised by semi-detached dwellings linked by single garages. The majority of the dwellings possess off street, car parking provision. There are no parking restrictions to the front of the appeal site, however, there are double yellow lines on the junctions with Riverdale Road and Arbuthnot Lane.
5. Meadowview is an unclassified road subject to a 30mph speed limit. It is a tree lined road possessing a verdant character and descends from Arbuthnot Lane towards Riverdale Road. The appeal dwelling occupies an elevated position relative to the road with steps up from the existing single driveway up to the front door. A low boundary wall encloses the established landscape planting within the front garden. I noted that Meadowview Road was lightly trafficked with few pedestrian movements at the time of my visit in the mid morning.
6. The appeal site has an existing vehicular crossover which would be widened by 400mm, and the existing street tree on the pavement to the front of the appeal site would be retained. To facilitate the provision of additional parking space, the low brick wall and planting would be removed, as this would have the effect of improving the visibility for vehicles manoeuvring in and out of the enlarged driveway.

7. The Highway Authority have objected to the proposal as the space demonstrated as proposed for vehicle parking could not be suitably accessed and egressed without driving along the footway.
8. In this regard, the appellants state that the plans showing a vehicle parked parallel to the side boundary are only indicative and that in practice a vehicle would be parked at an angle to use the existing driveway space for entry and exit. However, I am mindful that the plans are not labelled as indicative, and whilst the use of a car as a template could be deemed to be so, there is no evidence in the planning application documents that a revised parking layout was intended to be indicative only. I must therefore assess the appeal on the basis of the detail and layout provided on the proposed plans.
9. The proposed location of the parking space as shown on the plan clearly presents practical challenges due to the projection of the front doorsteps. This configuration would necessitate vehicular manoeuvres across and along the pavement, introducing the potential for conflict with pedestrians, to the detriment of pedestrian safety. Although it is conceivable that a modest-sized vehicle may be able to fit into the parking space which measures a maximum of 4.8m in length and 2.4m in width, I must have regard to the likelihood that future occupants of the dwelling may possess larger vehicles which would protrude over the pavement creating an obstruction for pedestrians as result of what would be permanent development.
10. To address this situation, the appellants suggest a condition requiring landscape planting along the front boundary to ensure no overhang of vehicles onto the footway. However, planting is likely to have an adverse effect on any available visibility and would also restrict the depth of the parking space thus further impeding vehicular manoeuvres. Therefore, the suggested planning condition would not overcome these concerns.
11. Whilst I understand that the existing parking arrangement is inconvenient for the appellants in terms of access to and from the garage with minimal circulation space around the car when parked, the benefits of the appeal proposal do not outweigh the identified harms to highway safety.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in a significant harmful effect on highway safety and would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and policy T4 of the London Plan (2021) and policy DP24 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023) which amongst other matters seek to ensure highway safety for all users would not be unduly compromised.

Other Matters

13. The appellants have drawn my attention to other similar arrangements of widened dropped kerbs within Meadowview Road. Whilst I observed these at the time of the site visit the full circumstances of these cases and when or if planning permission was sought is unclear. In any event, I have considered this appeal on its own merits and the site-specific circumstances as presented and observed.
14. I have also noted the appellants frustration regarding the apparent lack of engagement from the Council, but this is not a matter of planning merit which would affect the consideration of the main issue. Furthermore, whilst I recognise there to have been a lack of objections from neighbouring occupiers to the proposal, an absence of objections is a neutral factor which neither weighs in support nor

against the appeal proposal and does not alter my findings on the acceptability of the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposed would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations, that outweigh the harm and associated development plan conflict.
16. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR