



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/19/3235081

57 Castle Road, Newport PO30 1DT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Laura Maxim against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00324/HOU, dated 27 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is provision of off-road car parking space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace property located on the south-eastern side of Castle Road, a 'B' classified road, which at this point is subject to a 30mph speed limit. There are parking restrictions in place along sections of Castle Road, notably outside the appeal site. These restrictions are interspersed with sporadic on-street parking on the odd-numbered side of the road. A number of properties benefit from dropped kerbs and off-road parking. However, frontages vary in sizes and so does the usability of parking spaces.
4. As part of the proposal, the entire frontage of the site would be laid to mono-block paving. The Council requires car parking spaces to measure 2.4m x 4.8m. The area to the front of the appeal property is very modest in size, and would not be deep enough to provide a car parking space which would accord with the Council's requirements, particularly by reason of the existing bay window protruding across part of the site's frontage. Whilst a vehicle could be parked at an angle across the proposed hardstanding area, it would nevertheless not be large enough to accommodate a turning area. As a result, drivers would then have to undertake protracted manoeuvres to exit the site safely.
5. I also note that adequate visibility splays could not be entirely provided within land in the appellant's control. This could have highway safety implications for pedestrians and road users, particularly in instances where drivers would seek to reverse onto the highway to exit the site. The appellant suggests that this issue could be addressed by installing a mirror within proximity to the parking bay exit. However, it is not clear whether it could be accommodated within the site. Additionally, such a fitting could be easily broken or dislodged, especially if

it was mounted at a low level adjacent to the footway. Therefore, this would not constitute a reliable solution to adequately mitigate the lack of visibility.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to similar parking arrangements within the area, notably at the adjacent property. Limited information has however been provided in respect of the circumstances which led to the implementation of such parking arrangements, and I am therefore not certain that they represent a direct parallel to the proposal before me which, in any event, I am required to assess on its individual merits.
7. I appreciate the situation of the appellant, whose mother is experiencing mobility issues. However, planning permission runs with the land rather than with the appellant. Consequently, if the appeal were to be allowed, the resultant parking arrangements would become a permanent feature, which would prejudice highway safety. This harm outweighs the weight which can be afforded to the personal circumstances of the appellant.
8. By reason of the constraints associated with the site, the proposal would result in the creation of inadequate access and parking arrangements, which would be detrimental to highway safety. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy DM2 of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy (March 2012) which, amongst other things, requires development proposals to provide a safe and accessible built environment.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR