



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/19/3231394

40 Old Redbridge Road, Southampton SO15 0NJ

- 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 Ian Hallt against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00596/FUL, dated 1 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "application to extend current drop kerb by removing one kerb stone to front of property. This is to allow access to an open driveway area, the driveway itself will be permeable to rainwater and will not require permission. The reason for application is due to road being listed on the classified road list."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed. However, a different wording has been entered which is extend current single driveway dropped kerb to allow access from highway to area of driveway which is to be renewed. The Council has used a further revised description which is alteration to highway access (including installation of dropped kerb to extend existing). The drawing submitted with the planning application shows that three kerbstones are proposed to be replaced with a dropped kerb. Accordingly, I have based my decision on the Council's description.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - Highway safety; and
 - On-street car parking demand.

Reasons

Highway safety

4. The appeal site is on the north side of Old Redbridge Road, within a mixed residential and commercial area bounded by the A35 Redbridge Flyover to the

north and the main line railway to the south. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced dwelling which has an integral garage with driveway parking in front for one car. Vehicular access is from Old Redbridge Road and benefits from a lowered kerb which extends across the width of the drive. The remaining part of the site frontage, which has a paving slabbed surface, is at a raised ground level in relation to the driveway. It wraps around a single storey porch, which projects to the front of the house, and its highway frontage is defined by a low metal railing fence. Old Redbridge Road is classified, and has pavements and unrestricted on-street parking on both sides within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.

5. According to the planning application drawing upon which the Council's decision was made, which is dimensioned but is not a drawing to scale, the appeal proposal would extend the existing dropped kerb by the same width again as the existing lowered kerbway in front of the drive. The extended access would be roughly opposite the front porch. The refused plan does not include detailed dimensions of the front porch nor a dimension from the front of the porch to the back edge of the footpath.
6. On my site inspection, I observed that a small car was parked on the driveway of the appeal property and that this was very close to the garage door. The small car fitted comfortably on the driveway without overhanging the pavement. However, having regard to the length of the parked car, and the estimated depth of the front porch, I consider it unlikely that there would be sufficient depth in front of the proposed extended dropped kerb to park a longer vehicle than a small car in a perpendicular position relative to the road without it overhanging the pavement.
7. The appellant's statement of case includes an additional drawing which is not to scale, but includes width dimensions. The drawing suggests that a vehicle can be parked perpendicular to the highway and adjacent to the side boundary with no.42 on the basis of a 2.2 m dimensioned width between the side of the porch and the side boundary with 42 Old Redbridge Road. This width is below the minimum recommended standard parking bay width and parking a vehicle in this position would require an element of manoeuvring, since the proposed scheme does not include the lowering of the kerb directly in front of this parking space. I am not, therefore, persuaded that in practice this parking arrangement would occur as an alternative to parking at right angles to and directly in front of the extended lowered kerb.
8. The alternative would be to park parallel to the highway. However, given the dimensioned width of the appeal site as shown on the planning application drawing, this would only enable one vehicle to be parked to the front of the house. Perpendicular parking is therefore more likely to occur as a result of extended dropped kerb, since otherwise there would be no resulting net gain in parking spaces. For the aforementioned reasons, this is likely to result in vehicles overhanging and obstructing the pavement to the potential detriment of the safety of pedestrians using the public footway.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that unacceptable harm would not be caused to the safety of pedestrians using the public highway. Accordingly, I cannot conclude that the proposal would accord with policies SDP1 and T12 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review – Adopted Version 2nd Revision 2015 (LP), which require new

development to protect the safety of the city and its citizens and only allow vehicular access from classified roads where road safety would not be adversely affected.

On-street car parking demand

10. The appeal proposal would result in the loss of an on-street parking space in front of the site. Both parties are agreed that on-street car parking demand within the vicinity of the appeal site is high, including from users of nearby business premises and the occupiers of residential properties. On my site inspection, I observed a number of business premises within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, including a public house on the opposite side of the road and various commercial uses further east.
11. The appellant contends that the removal of an on-street parking space would improve the safety of drivers and pedestrians by providing a larger area for road using vehicles to manoeuvre around each other. I am not aware that this is an existing problem in the locality and indeed there are no parking restrictions in the road that relate to such a matter. I do not consider that the potential easing of traffic congestion/movements that would result from such a small area of additional road width to outweigh the additional inconvenience and reduction in living conditions of the occupants of the residential properties within the immediate locality of the site. I reach this view in the knowledge that both parties acknowledge that users of the public house often park on the street nearby.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal is likely to harm the living conditions of the occupiers nearby residential and other properties due to the resulting inconvenience associated with a reduction in available on-street parking, in an area with an acknowledged high demand for such parking. As such, the proposal would not accord with LP policy SDP1, which, amongst other things, aims to ensure that new development does not unacceptably affect the amenity of the city and its citizens. The Council's refusal reason also refers to LP policy SDP9. This policy relates to the scale, massing and appearance of buildings. Therefore, I do not find it to be directly relevant to this main issue.

Conclusion

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

S Leonard

INSPECTOR