



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3371674

148 Slade Green Road, Erith, Bexley DA8 2JE

- 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 David Tarrant against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 25/00764/FUL.
 - The development proposed is detached garden room and boundary wall including sliding gates.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to visibility.
 - The effect of the development on flood risk and the risk of flooding to the development.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Highway Safety

4. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace residential dwelling on Slade Green Road. Its west elevation forms a boundary with Plantation Road, which is an unclassified no through road serving the residential street. Whilst the area is not a controlled parking zone, there are parking bays marked on part of the footway by the side of the appeal property and along Plantation Road which were all occupied during my site visit.
5. To the rear of the property there is a single storey rear extension and a hardstanding with a crossover to Plantation Road. The remaining rear of the property is relatively level garden and whilst there is a boundary fence separating the appeal property and its neighbour to the east, there are no boundary treatments to the remainder of the west and south aspects of the rear garden. Directly to the rear of the appeal property there is a private road. 2 Plantation Road is the other

side of this road and its boundary wall at the junction is high. At the time of my site visit, which I appreciate is a snapshot in time, the private road appeared overgrown, and a vehicle was parked blocking the end of the private road accessing Plantation Road.

6. The proposed outbuilding would form the boundary to the private road and part of the side boundary to Plantation Road. Users exiting the private road, either in forward or reverse gear, would be unable to see pedestrians and footway users until they have passed the proposed building due to the positioning and height of it. This would mean that the vehicle would already have crossed the footway with zero visibility in this direction, harmfully increasing the risk of collision with pedestrians. Whilst No.2's boundary treatment is out of the Appellant's control and does not form part of the proposal, it is, nonetheless, tall and would also impede visibility in the other direction upon exiting the private road.
7. I acknowledge that Plantation Road is a Local Access Road and is a dead end. It is therefore relatively quiet in comparison to other roads. Even so, that would not prevent the risk of collision between vehicles and pedestrians identified above.
8. The private road is overgrown and there are elements of rubbish scattered about. Even if the road is not used as an access, vehicles use the entrance/exit of the private road as a parking area. These vehicles would be hindered in the same manner as I have already explained.
9. Although the Appellant is willing to install a bollard at the entrance to the private road, the private road does not form part of the application red line. Therefore, I cannot be certain that it is under their control.
10. The proposed location of a gate next to the extension would limit the width of the hardstanding to be used for parking. As a result, the visibility of pedestrians using the footway would be obscured by the rear extension when exiting. Furthermore, the proposed boundary wall would obscure visibility of pedestrians in the other direction, leading to an increase in the risk of collision with pedestrians and therefore an increase in harm to highway safety.
11. Even if vehicles exercised caution whilst exiting onto Plantation Road from either the private road or the parking, I am not satisfied that the harm identified above would be overcome. The positioning and height of the proposed development would obscure visibility leading to an increased risk of collision between footway users and vehicles.
12. I have been directed to other development in the vicinity to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed scheme. However, I have not been provided with any substantive detail of those developments and as such I cannot be certain against which development plan and policies those developments were considered or if they even have permission at all. Regardless, they are all located outside of Plantation Road. I attribute them little weight.
13. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable adverse effect on highway safety, with regard to visibility. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021) and the Bexley Local Plan (2023) (the Local Plan) Policies SP10, DP23 and DP24, all of which seek to ensure highway safety. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the

Framework) in so far as it seeks to create safe places which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

Flood risk

14. The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Footnote 59 of the Framework sets out that a site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development within Flood Zones 2 and 3.
15. There is no assessment on flood risk before me. Therefore, I cannot be certain over the flood risk the development is exposed to, and what, if any, mitigation measures may be needed. Nor can I be certain that the development does not increase flood risk in the area. Due to the lack of a site-specific flood risk assessment, as required, the development is contrary to the Framework and to Policy DP32 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge that the Appellant is seeking to improve security, create secure storage, create some private space and that living arrangements may have been affected by the storage of equipment within the household. However, the proposed development would be harmful as identified above, a harm that would not be outweighed by these matters in this case.
17. I acknowledge that a suitable scheme to enhance the rear of the appeal property would be a benefit to the character and appearance of the area. However, the harm to highway safety identified above would not be outweighed in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. As such, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR