

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/16/3155877

1 Moorside Street, Bradford, BD12 0EW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Deborah Brett against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02951/FUL, dated 7 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a change of use from highway to private curtilage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Moorside Street is small residential cul-de-sac off Abb Scott Lane. There is a narrow footway along part of one side of the street, and there is no formal turning head. The appeal site comprises an area of unadopted highway that is currently grassed over in part. It occupies approximately half the width of the highway at the end of Moorside Street, in front of Nos 2-4.
 4. The proposal would reduce the width of the highway to around five and a half metres. This would result in a loss of parking space and a narrowing of the access to Nos 2-4. It would also prevent vehicles from turning around at the end of the street given the lack of a formal turning head. This would mean that vehicles would have to reverse a significant distance in order to exit the street, over an area used by both pedestrians and vehicles. This would be likely to lead to pedestrian and highway safety issues. Whilst there may be an opportunity to reverse into the driveway in front of No 1, vehicles would still need to reverse a significant distance down the street to reach this point.
 5. The appeal site is not in a poor condition, and it was not particularly untidy at the time of my site visit. Whilst the proposal would be likely to ensure its on-going maintenance, this consideration does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
-

6. I conclude that the development would prejudice highway and pedestrian safety. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policy TM2 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005).

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR