The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by V Lucas LLB (Hons) MCD MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3243769
Rockleaze Cottage, Julian Road, Sneyd Park, Bristol BS9 1NQ

- 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 Thomas Sain against the decision of Bristol City Council.
- The application Ref 19/02241/F, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2019.
- The development proposed is described as Proposal to convert existing kerb to dropped kerb to allow for the creation of a parking space for one (electric) car in front of the property.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property, a two storey cottage, is prominently located on the corner of Julian Road and Rockleaze Road within the residential area of Sneyd Park in Bristol, close to Clifton Down and within The Downs Conservation Area (CA).

5. This is a quiet and pleasant residential area, and this part of Julian Road has several garages directly facing the highway on both sides of the road towards the open space of Clifton Down. The front elevation of the cottage is sited directly next to and behind these garages. In addition, there is on street parking also evident in the vicinity. The proposed development would result in an off street parking space parallel to the front elevation and close to the junction with Rockleaze Road. The submitted plans show that this parking space, whilst sufficient for a car to be sited off road, would be orientated so that drivers would have to reverse either in or out.

6. The limited traffic at this point would be likely to be travelling at low speed and as stated above, there are numerous examples of off-street parking in the vicinity in addition to on street parking, including around the junction of

Rockleaze Road and Julian Road. As such, drivers will be expecting cars pulling in and out to some extent.

7. However, the parking space would be close to the junction, and given the limited visibility caused by the orientation and position of the cottage and the siting of the neighbouring garages, a stationary or reversing vehicle would be likely to cause disruption to the flow of traffic on the highway and there would be a high probability that vehicle collisions could occur as a result. Whilst drawing JRC6 of the appeal statement shows an unobstructed 25m visibility from the proposed parking space in both directions, I noted from my site visit for example that a vehicle existing the junction from Rockleaze Road would not be expecting a vehicle to be manoeuvring from the proposed parking space and would have limited visibility of it until it was within close proximity. This could cause drivers of vehicles to brake suddenly which would be likely to lead to a risk of collisions from behind. A dropped kerb in front of the parking space as proposed would not be sufficiently visible to drivers to provide adequate notice of the likelihood of a vehicle using the proposed space.

8. Any drivers parking in the garages along this part of Julian Road also have an awkward entrance and exit, however the garages are sited away from the junction and are clearly visible to other drivers. It is noted that as outlined by the appellants, there are no recorded personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the site, the development would remove the requirement for one car to park on the street and the level of traffic turning for one space is low, however this would not justify the risk of disruption and conflict outlined above. It is understood that the proposed parking space is to be provided for an electric car with the environmental benefits that his would bring, however it is not possible to ensure that that this remains the case through condition and as such I can give this limited weight.

9. In light of the above, I conclude that a safe and adequate access would not be provided. The proposed access would have a detrimental impact upon highway safety contrary to Policy DM23 of the Bristol Local Plan - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014), which requires that development provide a safe and adequate access and does not result in unacceptable traffic conditions. The proposal also conflicts with paragraph 108 of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard.

Other Matter

10. It is noted that the site lies within the Downs CA. No information is provided regarding its designation, however it is evident that its significance lies with the quality of its large traditional buildings of which many are unaltered. Given the limited nature of the development and the amount of existing off-street parking in the vicinity of the appeal site, the development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

V Lucas

INSPECTOR