

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2016

by A A Phillips BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/16/3160730

18 Eastfield Avenue, Knottingley, West Yorkshire WF11 0JW

- 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 Stewart Groom against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01175/FUL, dated 8 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is new front boundary fence and gates approximately 1.5m in height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. I note from the planning application form and my observations on site that the application is retrospective. The proposed boundary fence and gates have been erected and I have dealt with this appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular reference to visibility.

Reasons

4. At the time of my site visit in the middle of the day mid-week I observed that the roads in the vicinity of the site were quiet, however, it would be reasonable to assume that the level of traffic in the residential area would increase at peak hours in the mornings and evenings. I also observed that the roads are fairly narrow and that vehicles were parked on the street near to the site, which restricted the width of the road and hindered visibility near to the junction.
 5. The Council's Highways Team has confirmed that at a height of greater than 1.0m within the desired 2.4m by 43m sight line the proposal does not ensure that adequate visibility is provided for vehicles exiting Northfield Road onto Eastfield Avenue.
 6. From my own observations I noted that as a consequence of the location and height of the proposal, visibility when exiting the junction is restricted. Furthermore, in order to pass a vehicle parked on the opposite side Eastfield Avenue near to the appeal site, vehicles travelling west had to cross onto the
-

east bound side of the road, causing hazardous conditions close to the junction. This problem would be increased if multiple vehicles parked on the road near to the junction.

7. Therefore, as a result of the height, design and location of the proposal it would result in hazardous conditions to road users by compromising vehicular sight lines at the junction of Eastfield Avenue and Northfield Road.
8. The proposal would also restrict pedestrian and vehicle visibility at the access into the appeal site. Some pedestrians (particularly smaller children) approaching the access would have very limited visibility over the boundary fence of vehicles intending to exit the site. This concern is exacerbated by the fact that the driveway slopes downwards from the edge of the footpath towards the garage at No 18 Eastfield Avenue. Although I understand that it is possible to manoeuvre vehicles to enter and exit the site in forward gear I remain concerned that the proposal would compromise pedestrian visibility to the detriment of safety.
9. Therefore, the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety with particular reference to visibility. It therefore conflicts with Policy D14 of the Wakefield Metropolitan District Council Local Development Framework Development Policies Document April 2009 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and taking account of all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR