

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2017

**by R J Maile BSc FRICS**

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

**Decision date: 28 July 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/17/3173231**

**50 Straight Road, Old Windsor, Windsor, Berkshire, SL4 2RX.**

- 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 Heidie Grech against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
  - The application ref: 16/03741, dated 18 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2017.
  - The development proposed is vehicular access to Straight Road, Old Windsor (A308) to allow for 2 parking spaces on the front garden of 50 Straight Road.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed vehicular access upon highway safety and the free flow of traffic along Straight Road.

## Reasons

3. The subject property forms one of a pair of semi-detached houses with direct frontage to Straight Road (A308), which is classified as a primary distributor road, running through the Borough and connecting the M40 through Windsor and Old Windsor to the A30/M25. Straight Road in the vicinity of the appeal site is subject to a 30mph speed limit.
  4. No. 50 is located midway along a 220m stretch of the road. There are some 26 dwellings along this frontage, of which 13 possess direct access and dropped kerbs to the main road. These were noted during my site visit. Many of them, however, do not benefit from a service road which, in the case of the appeal site, provides access to a garage and two car parking spaces to the rear. This shared access serves a total of 11 properties (nos. 44-64 inclusive), although nos. 62 and 64 have direct access onto the main road by means of a shared section of dropped kerb.
  5. My attention has been directed to a proposal for a new vehicular access at 62 Straight Road, which also benefits from the rear service road access. In that
-

case the application was refused by the Council, but a subsequent appeal was allowed. I have been provided with a copy of the Inspector's decision dated 29 March 2011 (ref: APP/T0355/D/11/2146235).

6. At paragraph 9 of his decision the Inspector noted that the proposal would reduce pressure on the existing shared access, which is single track. He also commented that:

*"Vehicles meeting in the shared access would not be able to pass, so that drivers entering the drive might at times reverse back into the carriageway in order to allow other vehicles to leave."*

7. I accept that a similar situation may occur in the case of no. 50. Nevertheless, the appeal site is much closer to the junction of the service road with Straight Road, such that this possibility is lessened. It is also the case, having regard to the narrow frontage of no. 50, that no provision for on-site turning can be made as part of the scheme before me. Of necessity, therefore, vehicles would have to reverse into or from the highway when entering or leaving the site.
8. "Saved" Policy T5 of the Local Plan<sup>1</sup> states that all development proposals will be expected to comply with the Council's adopted Highway Design Standards. These state that on primary and district distributor roads the maintenance of free flowing traffic conditions and reasonable speeds takes precedence over the need for access and that the Highway Authority, where possible, will seek to reduce the number of direct accesses onto a primary or district distributor road.
9. No. 50 is situated close to a 'bus stop and the commencement of a right turn facility serving Meadow Way on the opposite side of Straight Road. Traffic speeds are to some extent restricted by a speed camera to the southeast of the site. Nevertheless, this is a heavily trafficked primary distributor route where the Highway Authority rightly seeks to minimise the number of direct vehicular access points.
10. The photographs submitted with the appeal papers indicate a number of parked service vehicles on Straight Road close to the appeal site. Apparently, the telephone box outside the appeal site results in the regular parking of vehicles close by. However, the addition of two off-street parking spaces to serve the subject property will not necessarily assist in alleviating such kerbside parking.
11. My decision in this case has been influenced by the fact that no. 50 possesses adequate off-street parking facilities, albeit to the rear and served by a narrow service road. Moreover, although not determinative I have noted that visibility to the northwest for vehicles emerging from the new access would be restricted by the presence of the existing street furniture. For these reasons, the scheme before me can be differentiated from that at 62 Straight Road.
12. I therefore find upon the main issue that the addition of a further access onto the main road would have an adverse impact upon highway safety and the free flow of traffic along Straight Road, contrary to "saved" Policy T5 of the Local Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 1999 (incorporating Alterations adopted in June 2003).

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*R. J. Maile*

INSPECTOR