
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by N Bowden BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3371718

2 Wybridge, Keysoe, Bedfordshire MK44 2HL

- 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 Justin Lawrence against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00419/FUL.
 - The development proposed is extension of dropped kerb and vehicle crossover.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

4. There is a discrepancy between the original description of the development as shown on the planning application form and that used by the Council on the decision notice. I have taken the description of the development in the banner heading above from the Council's decision notice, as it provides a concise description of the proposal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The site is situated in a rural residential area and comprises of a mid-terrace dwelling set back from the road with a deep front garden which tapers and widens towards the road. It is situated close to the junction of Wybridge Close and Wybridge. On the opposite side of the road there is an unmade lay by which is used for car parking. The majority of the dwellings along Wybridge have off street car parking provision. There are no parking restrictions to the front of the appeal site and Wybridge is a classified 'B' road subject to a 30mph speed limit.
6. There is an existing pedestrian dropped kerb at the front gate of the appeal site, providing access to the lay by opposite. The appellants indicate this was installed for a former occupier requiring wheelchair access. Whilst its use maybe limited given most properties benefit from off street parking, it is the only pedestrian dropped kerb along this section of the road between number 1 and Proteus. It

facilitates safer crossing for pedestrians, including those using wheelchairs, mobility scooters or pushchairs. Additionally, on street parking on Wybridge Close is restricted, so visitors may park in the lay by. The single footway along Wybridge Close connects directly to the dropped kerb.

7. The proposal would result in the loss of a pedestrian crossing point and conflict between pedestrians and vehicles using the same dropped kerb access to the detriment of highway safety.
8. The highway authority recommended that a new, separate dropped kerb be provided to serve the driveway. The appellants have indicated they are amenable to this however, it is not the scheme before me and the appeal decision is based on the submitted proposal.
9. The highway authority has expressed concern that the proposal does not include an on-site turning area. As a result, vehicles would need to reverse onto or off the driveway from the road, which could compromise highway safety.
10. The appellants have submitted an amended plan with the appeal which shows a vehicle turning space within the site and a vehicle parking area. However, even if I were to accept the amended plan, it does not demonstrate with technical certainty that it would be possible to access and egress the driveway in a forward gear. Drivers reversing onto or out of the driveway would be performing a hazardous manoeuvre, which would not be immediately obvious or expected by other highway users.
11. 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 31 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan (2020) which seeks amongst other matters to not have any significant adverse impact on access to the public highway with attention to safety and suitable access arrangements for all members of the community.

Other Matters

12. I have carefully considered the personal circumstances in this case, but I am not persuaded that the benefits of the proposal outweigh the significant harm I have identified above. I am also mindful that circumstances and occupants can change, but the effect of the development would be permanent. Following careful consideration of the matter, I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing the appeal is proportionate and justified.
13. The proposal would enable the appellant to provide an opportunity for electric vehicle charging at their property which would have some sustainability benefits, however, this does not outweigh the significant harm identified above.
14. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties which do not have a turning area and reverse in and out of the road. The full circumstances of these cases and when or if planning permission was sought is unclear. I also note that one of the properties is situated on Kimbolton Road some distance from the appeal site. In any event, I have considered this appeal on its own merits and the site specific circumstances.

15. Whilst I note the appellants frustration regarding the apparent lack of engagement from the Council, these matters are between the main parties and do not affect the consideration of the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I 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.

N Bowden

INSPECTOR