

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2017

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 10 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/D/17/3168829
South View, Bridge Street, Rendham IP17 2AF

- 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 Miss Della Carr against the decision of Suffolk Coastal District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/3604/FUL, dated 28 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is formation of vehicular access and laying of hardstanding.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The description of the proposed development on the application form dated 28 August 2016 is lengthy and does not describe the proposed development very clearly. Therefore, for the sake of clarity, I consider this appeal on the basis of the description of the proposal given in the Council's decision notice dated 16 November 2016 which is clear and accurate.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the safety of users of the highway.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated on a sharp bend in the road, next to the junction of Bridge Street with Bruisyard Road. The proposed vehicular access would open onto the road, crossing a narrow pavement. Although views along the roads in all three directions are good from the pavement outside the appeal property, views of the road to the east for a driver of a car within the proposed parking area at the front of the appeal property would be obscured by the gardens and boundary treatments, and vehicles parked on front driveways, of the nearby properties to the east. This would mean that a driver of a vehicle would be unlikely to have a clear view of the road to the east until a large part of the vehicle is already on the road.
-

5. Views to the west from within the proposed parking area would be clearer. However, the appeal property is next to a public house which has a seating area at the front. People standing outside the public house could restrict views of the road to the west from the proposed parking area as well as act as a distraction to users of the highway. This does not weigh in favour of the proposed development.
6. The proposed parking area would not be big enough for a vehicle to drive into and leave the proposed parking area in a forward direction with ease. This would mean that vehicles would have to either manoeuvre into the parking area in reverse or reverse out onto the road when leaving. In a location with limited visibility, potential distractions from the road junction and nearby public house and on a bend in the road, such manoeuvring could result in significant risk to users of the highway. The appellant indicates that vehicles would only reverse into the site, which would be a less risky manoeuvre than reversing out onto the road. However, this pattern of driving could not be guaranteed and it would not overcome the risks to users of the highway as a consequence of manoeuvring on the road in a backwards direction in this location.

Conclusion

7. Use of the proposed development would be likely to result in significant harm to the safety of users of the highway, contrary to the general thrust of Policy DM22 of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy & Development Management Policies which requires new development to make provision for the development's functional requirements. Further, the development would fail to create a safe layout which would minimise conflict between users of the highway as indicated in paragraph 35. of the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore, for that above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR