
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by J Wilde C Eng MICE

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

Decision date: 04 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/17/3175504

47 & 49 Doubletrees, St Blazey, Par, Cornwall PL24 2LD

- 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 David Hassall & Mr Gary Simmons against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA17/01448, dated 7 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is permeable parking for 47 and 49 Doubletrees.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site.

Reasons

3. The appeal properties lie on a slight bend adjacent to the A390. The proposed development would see the creation of a shared parking area, parallel to the road and set behind the footway.
4. To enter and leave the proposed parking area would require cars to cross the footway, not at right angles as would be the case with a traditional driveway, but in a more parallel orientation. If one car was already in the parking area then the second one would require several movements, in all probability including a reversing one, to access the parking area. Drivers leaving the parking area would be pulling out onto the footway needing to be aware of both pedestrians and vehicles in front and behind, and there would be almost certainly be blind spots.
5. There is no footway on the other side of the road at this point meaning that the whole pedestrian flow would be on the same side as the proposed parking area. As there is a school a short distance away from the appeal site, it seems reasonable to assume that school children would use the footway to the front of the appeal properties, which is relatively narrow and situated on the inside of a bend. The creation of a dropped crossing at this point would also increase the perception of vulnerability and make it easier for pedestrians to encroach into the carriageway. Furthermore the presence of the drop crossing would also make it easier for vehicles to encroach onto the footway.

6. All of these factors lead me to conclude that the proposed development would significantly increase the danger to users of the highway, particularly pedestrians. There would therefore be conflict with policy 27 of the Cornwall Local Plan and with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Both of these require that development should provide safe and suitable access for all people.
7. In arriving at this conclusion I have taken note of the appellants' reasons for wanting the new parking area, including the existing parking situation and medical reasons. I am also aware that some benefit may be provided to visibility by the removal of high walls and pillars. These matters do not however lead me to an alternative conclusion. I also note that there are similar parking arrangements elsewhere in the area. However, from the information available to me these were allowed under a different planning regime, and in any case, their presence does not to my mind justify allowing the present appeal given the potential harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

8. In light of the above reasoning and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR