

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL

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

Decision date: 24 November 2016

Appeal Reference: APP/Q3115/D/16/3159445

Land at 11 Hagbourne Road, Didcot OX11 8DP

- 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 Mr K Murphy against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application (reference P16/S1081/HH, dated 12 February 2016) was refused by notice dated 4 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as a “proposed additional vehicle access to front elevation and dropped kerb”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed crossover on highway safety and convenience.

Reasons

3. Hagbourne Road is a busy route that serves a wider area, taking traffic away from Broadway towards East Hagbourne, to the south, though Jubilee Way now bypasses the immediate locality. The high level of on-street parking along the road reduces the effective width of the carriageway and, of course, the appeal site lies within an area where vehicle speeds are controlled in any case. Nevertheless, the road is well used and vehicle speeds can be relatively high (within the speed limit).
4. The road frontages are lined with built development that is mainly residential in character, although, for example, there is a dentist’s surgery adjacent to the appeal site. Some properties stand close to their highway boundaries but others are set back with parking provision within the curtilage.
5. The existing dwelling at 11 Hagbourne Road stands on a wider plot than many others in the vicinity and its front garden area is deep enough to incorporate space for car parking. The space is laid out to create a driveway through the front garden that would allow cars to drive through the plot. Even so, the route has not been completed by making the necessary connection to the carriageway itself (and a dropped kerb has not been installed).

6. Under the broad heading "Promoting sustainable transport", Section 4 of the NPPF deals with a number of transport related issues. One particular aim is to achieve "safe and suitable access" (paragraph 32). Similarly, Policy T1 of the 'South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011' has the aim to "provide for a safe and convenient access to the highway network".
7. It must be acknowledged that there are many existing crossovers, on both sides of Hagbourne Road, and that where new dwellings have been created, new access points have been necessary. It can also be observed that some existing properties have more than one crossover on their frontages.
8. Nevertheless, the proposed new access point would create an additional crossover in Hagbourne Road and would, thereby, reduce the space available for parking on the highway as well as introducing a new point for turning traffic. Vehicles leaving the appeal site would be more easily able to leave the site in forward gear, though there would be no requirement for them to do so.
9. On balance, the new access point would cause some additional disruption to the free flow of traffic on the public highway and would reduce the scope for on-street parking where there is evidently some pressure at present. Thus, it would erode highway safety and add to on-street parking difficulties. On the other hand, there would be some limited benefit to the occupiers of number 11 by the provision of a second access point.
10. I accept that the proposed crossover would provide some benefit to the occupiers of number 11 Hagbourne Road but, nevertheless, I am convinced that the effect on highway safety and the loss of a parking space on the roadside would outweigh the benefit. Hence, I have concluded that the scheme before me would conflict with both the 'National Planning Policy Framework' and the Development Plan. I am convinced, therefore, that the appeal must fail and, although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.

Roger C Shrimplin

INSPECTOR