



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/25/3372244

51 The Scotchill, Coventry CV6 2EW

- 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 Levi Swift against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0001381/HHA.
 - The development proposed is a dropped kerb for vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid-terrace property on a classified road, which is a busy main thoroughfare with a 30mph speed limit. At the time of my site visit there was an existing area of hardstanding in front of the host dwelling with cars parked on it. On this part of the road, including outside the appeal site, there are no parking restrictions, and vehicles were parked on the highway.
4. Other properties along the road have off-road parking areas, similar to the appeal site, some with and some without dropped kerbs. Most lack turning space to allow vehicles to leave the off-road parking areas in forward gear, as per the appeal proposal. However, no substantive evidence has been provided to confirm whether these existing nearby dropped kerbs have planning permission, or to allow full comparison with the appeal proposal. I have therefore determined the appeal scheme on its own merits.
5. While the proposal would enable off-road parking for the occupiers of the appeal dwelling without reducing overall parking in the area, it would not create shared parking provision. Also, the proposal would not prevent vehicles parking either side of the access and further along the road. From my site observations, parked vehicles near the proposed dropped kerb would likely restrict visibility, particularly for vehicles reversing off the driveway. At the time of my site visit, I observed that visibility of oncoming traffic was limited by parked cars on the highway, even when exiting in forward gear from nearby Morton Close. This restricted visibility would reduce reaction time for approaching vehicles along the road, increasing the risk of highway incidents.

6. Even if drivers would exercise caution when leaving the driveway due to the presence of parked cars and other street features, this would not guarantee the risk of collision with pedestrians and other vehicles would be eliminated.
7. Although other existing dropped kerb accesses exist nearby and the appellants assert there have been no accidents as a result of these, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that they provide safe points of access. Furthermore, even if the existing local context of parked cars, traffic speed and other driveways would make pedestrians and drivers more aware of potential conflicts and dangers, the proposal would increase vehicular manoeuvring, including the reversing of vehicles, across the footway. This would increase potential conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, which would likely increase the risk of conflict and harm to pedestrians. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that in adding an additional vehicular access on such a busy, classified road would be safe in this instance.
8. In view of the above, the proposal would likely cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to Policies AC1 and AC2 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (December 2017). These policies respectively require, amongst other matters, that development proposals integrate with existing roads and consider the accessibility needs of everyone and does not cause unacceptable highway safety problems.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it.
10. Accordingly, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR