



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 January 2021

by Rachel Walmsley MSc, MA, BSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/W/20/3260901

Billet Hut, Craven Lane, Southam, CV47 1PG

- 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 Dhaliwal against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03442/FUL, dated 5 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing Billet Hut (Class D1) and the proposed erection of two semi-detached dwellings (Class C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. Being a narrow one-way street with double yellow lines on both sides, opportunities for parking in Craven Lane are severely limited. Vehicles can park on one side of the road at the far ends of the street but otherwise parking restrictions, together with the proximity of business units that create a demand for parking, create a high competition for parking overall.
4. The Council's adopted parking standards indicate a need for four car parking spaces for the development proposed. No parking is proposed. As a result the demand for parking created by the development would increase the competition for parking on Craven Lane. This, in turn, would impede the flow of traffic and jeopardise highway safety.
5. The survey before me suggests that there are parking spaces on nearby streets. Whilst the survey was carried out at a time when most residents could be expected to be at home, it only represents two days and at similar times. The survey is not, therefore, a reliable indicator of parking space availability. Furthermore, the number of spaces available on-street are limited and so the available parking would not regularly or significantly accommodate the development proposed to have no effect on its surroundings. Displacement parking is highly likely.
6. Furthermore, the available spaces cannot be seen from the appeal site. And whilst they are not far away, they are far enough to make walking between the

car and the development proposed unattractive, particularly for those with children or who are carrying shopping. The spaces are therefore in an inconvenient location, compelling prospective residents to park closer to the site. This would increase the competition for parking and exacerbate the harm associated with this.

7. I recognise that the adopted parking standards are a starting point when considering development proposals; policy CS.26 of the Core Strategy (2016) states that development will only be permitted if necessary mitigation is provided against any unacceptable transport impacts which arise from the development. Cycle parking is proposed but there are no measures identified to incentivise prospective occupiers to cycle rather than use the car. The appeal site is within a convenient location of some services and facilities and indeed this is a benefit of the development, that of housing in a sustainable location. However, there is no guarantee that future occupiers of the proposed development will not have access to one or more vehicles.
8. All in all, I find that the proposed development would be harmful to highway safety and therefore would be contrary to policy CS.26 of the Core Strategy (2016) which seeks development that can be accommodated safely by the existing road network.

Other matters

9. Whilst the proposal would increase housing supply, it would involve only two units of accommodation. Similarly, given the size of the premises, any positive local economic and social benefits would be small. These matters attract limited weight. The environmental benefit of improving the visual quality of the site carries moderate weight.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's grievances regarding the overturn at planning committee of the Officer's recommendation for approval. However, a recommendation to committee is just that with Members able to decide the application based on the Officer's recommendation and all other material factors.

Conclusion

11. I have concluded that the development would have a harmful effect on highway safety. The other matters raised in support do not outweigh the harm identified. For the reasons given, the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and therefore the appeal is dismissed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR