



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2026

by Hannah Guest BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/W/25/3375228

171 Enville Road, Kinver, Staffordshire DY7 6BN

- 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 Estate of Mrs D Glover against the decision of South Staffordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00473/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and construction of detached bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. Enville Road provides a principal route through Kinver towards the A458 Bridgnorth Road. During my visit, there were reasonably frequent vehicle movements along the section of road where the appeal site is located, notwithstanding a temporary closure on the High Street which may have reduced through-traffic. The road is lit, with footways on both sides, and is subject to a 30-mph speed limit. From my observations on site, most vehicles appeared to be travelling around this speed.
4. The existing vehicle access serves No. 171 Enville Road and two dwellings to the rear, Nos. 167 and 169 Enville Road. It is positioned adjacent to a row of terraced houses which do not benefit from off-street parking, resulting in a line of vehicles parked on-street on the same side of the road as the appeal site.
5. The proposal would intensify the use of the existing access. The Highway Authority therefore requires visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres in both directions, a requirement not directly disputed by the appellant.
6. The submitted Proposed Block Plan¹ demonstrates that the visibility splays cannot be achieved. On site, I observed that the southern splay would extend across third-party land, and the tall evergreen hedge along the frontage of No. 163 Enville Road would obstruct visibility. To the north, although generally more open, a telegraph pole and lamppost on the footway adjacent to the access would partly restrict views. In addition, the northern splay has not been plotted to the nearside

¹ Drawing No: 25-778-5

edge of the highway, contrary to Manual for Streets guidance, and no justification has been provided for this.

7. A Highways and Transport Technical Note² has been submitted to support the appeal. It illustrates potential improvements to the access arrangements to allow two-way vehicle passing and a 2-metre pedestrian visibility splay. However, it does not address the required vehicular visibility splays or how they could be achieved.
8. In the absence of adequate visibility splays, a driver exiting the appeal site in a forward gear would be unlikely to see approaching traffic until the vehicle had encroached onto the carriageway, creating a clear risk of collision and conflict with other road users. I also observed vehicles using the gap in on-street parking directly in front of the existing access as a passing place. Drivers giving way in this location would not reasonably anticipate another vehicle projecting into the carriageway from the existing access.
9. While the access is longstanding and serves three properties, and despite the absence of any recorded injury accidents nearby, the proposal would intensify its use and thereby increase the risk of collision. The provision of entrance markings would not adequately mitigate this risk.
10. Although the site's accessible location may reduce reliance on the private car, there is nothing to prevent future occupants from owning and using one. The existence of a substandard access does not justify permitting further harmful development, and given the current highway arrangement and conditions, I find no basis for departing from the Highway Authority's visibility splay requirements.
11. For the reasons above, the additional vehicle movements arising from the proposal, albeit limited in number, would result in an unacceptable adverse effect on highway safety, which cannot be mitigated. While the Council's reason for refusal does not identify a specific conflict with the development plan, Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that an unacceptable adverse effect on highway safety, such as this, is a justified basis for preventing development on highway grounds.
12. I acknowledge the presence of other direct frontage parking along Enville Road. However, I have no evidence regarding the circumstances of those access points, and their existence does not lead me to a different conclusion

Other Matters

13. In terms of benefits, the proposal would deliver a bungalow in an accessible location, suitable for older persons or those with mobility concerns, which is a type of accommodation needed in Kinver. The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The latest land supply position was 0.87 years, which is a chronic shortfall. While the scale of the proposal is modest, small sites, such as the appeal site, are often built out relatively quickly. The proposed dwelling would therefore help address the shortfall more promptly. Accordingly, I afford the delivery of the dwelling significant weight in my decision.

² 171 Enville Road, Kinver, Stourbridge, DY7 6BN, Highways and Transport Technical note, prepared by Flow Consult Limited, dated October 2025, Version V01.

14. The proposal would also result in modest economic and social benefits arising from the construction and occupation of the dwelling, as well as improvements to the current access arrangement for existing residents.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

15. Given the shortfall in housing supply, paragraph 11d) of the Framework falls to be considered. Permission should therefore be granted unless any adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
16. In this case, the proposal would have significant benefits. It would support the objective of the Framework in boosting the supply of homes in an area where there is currently a chronic shortfall in the supply of deliverable housing sites. It would also make an effective use of land and deliver a much-needed dwelling in an accessible location.
17. Nevertheless, I find that the intensified use of the existing vehicular access would give rise to an unacceptable highway safety risk that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. The proposal would therefore fail to provide safe and suitable access for all users, contrary to Paragraph 115 of the Framework. In line with Paragraph 116 of the Framework, I afford this adverse impact determinative weight, which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.
18. For the reasons above, having had regard to the Framework and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Hannah Guest

INSPECTOR