

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2017

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/D/17/3168776

281 Green Wrythe Lane, Carshalton, Surrey SM5 1TR

- 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 Waqas Saleem against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref C2016/74776/HHA was refused by notice dated 4 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the provision of a hard standing at front and vehicular access onto Green Wrythe Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of development given in the above heading is taken from the decision notice because the relevant section of the application form that requests a description of the proposed works is blank. Part E of the planning appeal form, which was completed by the appellant, indicates that the description of development has not changed and the same wording as that on the decision notice has been entered. The Council determined the application on that basis and therefore so shall I.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety for users of Green Wrythe Lane.

Reasons

4. The proposed vehicle crossover would be along the highway frontage of the appeal property, which faces Green Wrythe Lane. It would provide access for vehicles from the main highway to the front garden of No 281 for off-street vehicle parking on a new hard surfaced area.
 5. Although the number of vehicle movements using the new crossover would be relatively modest, the appeal scheme would result in motorists slowing down and either turning into or out of a busy road. That manoeuvre could be undertaken with restricted visibility given that views of oncoming road users might be obscured by on street parking on either side of the site and by buses using the stopping place on the opposite side of the carriageway, in front of the site. Given the limited space available within the front garden to No 281 to
-

turn a vehicle so that a motorist can both enter and exit in forward gear, it is highly likely that drivers using the proposed crossover would do so in reverse. This arrangement would pose an obvious and significant risk to highway safety even if traffic slows on the approach to the stopping place if a bus occupies it and a motorist enters or exits the site with the bus in full view.

6. The appellant states that the opportunity to park within the front garden of the appeal property would remove the potential obstruction to traffic flows along Green Wrythe Lane from on street parking. However, vehicles changing speed and turning into or out of the site, possibly in reverse, could similarly interrupt the movement of vehicles along this road.
7. At the site visit, I saw many instances of properties with dropped kerbs and off-street car parking on hard surfaces along the same side of Green Wrythe Lane as the site, including those to which the appellant has referred and provided photographs. A number of existing accesses off this highway also rely on reversing manoeuvres. I am unaware of the detailed circumstances of these arrangements most of which are far from ideal with regard to highway safety. These examples do not persuade me that the appeal scheme, which would add to highway danger, should therefore be accepted.
8. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on highway safety for users of Green Wrythe Lane. As such, it conflicts with Policy DM21 of the Council's Site Development Policies Development Plan Document and Core Policy BP10 of the Core Planning Strategy Development Plan Document. These policies seek to ensure that development does not prejudice the safe operation of the highway network.
9. I acknowledge that the opportunity to park a vehicle off road immediately in front of the dwelling may diminish the risk of theft and vandalism. It would also be a more convenient alternative to parking on the street, which would be further away from the dwelling. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. Overall, for the reasons set out above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR