



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/20/3260574

46 Suffield Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP11 2JL

- 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 Pawez Akhtar against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/05951/FUL, dated 2 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a hardstanding to park cars with a retaining wall and a dropped curb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hardstanding to park cars with a retaining wall and a dropped curb at 46 Suffield Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP11 2JL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/05951/FUL, dated 2 March 2020, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the hardstanding and retaining wall had been constructed, but not the dropped curb. I am therefore considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety, with regard to the adequacy of parking provision.

Reasons

4. The Council describe the road as unclassified and with a 30 mile per hour speed restriction. Houses are set back from the road behind a footway and have front gardens, several of which close to the appeal site have been developed as hardstanding parking areas. There are parking bays on the appeal site side of the road, including in front of the appeal site, restricted to permit holders or pay and display ticket holders between 9am and 5pm from Monday to Saturday.
5. Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance (2015) (BCPG) sets a minimum parallel parking bay length of 6 metres. The proposed 7.5 metre dropped curb would therefore lead to the loss of 1 on street car parking space. The hardstanding is designed to accommodate 2 cars, although a neighbour has

suggested that 3 cars park there. The development has therefore increased overall parking provision in the area and reduced the demand for on street parking. It has not increased the potential for dangerous and obstructive parking or the need for residents to park further along the road from their homes, as the Council suggest. In my opinion the development would cause no harm to highways safety and the Council has provided no evidence that it has done so.

6. The development does not therefore conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Nor would it conflict with Policy DM33 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019), the BCPG, Buckinghamshire County Council Highways Development Management Guidance document (2018) and Buckinghamshire County Council Local Transport Plan 4 (2016) which seek the provision of appropriate parking and to ensure safe and convenient access to the local highway.

Other Matters

7. A neighbour raised concerns regarding the lawfulness of the development and the availability of on street parking and its effect on access for emergency vehicles. As I have concluded that the development would be acceptable and would not lead to an increase in pressure for on street parking, it follows that there would be no harm regarding these matters.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR