



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 November 2021

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/21/3279748

53 Monkton Street, Ryde PO33 2BB

- 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 and Mrs J Moorman against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00536/HOU, dated 7 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the "demolition of porch and existing first floor bathroom extension, construction of single and double storey rear extension, formation of new vehicle access from highway".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Demolition of porch and existing bathroom extension; proposed single/two storey rear extension; alterations; formation of new vehicular access at 53 Monkton Street, Ryde, PO33 2BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00536/HOU, dated 7 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: S1179-PL01 Block and Location Plans, S1179-PL02 Existing Ground Floor and Site Plan, S1179-PL04 Existing First Floor, S1179-PL06 Proposed Ground Floor and Site Plan, S1179-PL07 Proposed First Floor, S1179-PL08 Proposed Elevations, S1179-PL09 Proposed Partial Site Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The Council's decision notice has three reasons for refusal relating to the site's proximity to the signalised junction of Monkton Street and St Johns Hill, the restricted vehicular visibility, and the lack of adequate facilities to enable vehicles to enter and leave the appeal site in a safe manner.
3. Therefore, with the above in mind, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms a semi-detached dwelling which seeks planning permission to alter and extend the property which includes remodelling the

front garden area to create an off-street parking space. The Council does not raise an issue regarding the proposed extensions and from the information that has been presented before me, I see no reason to disagree. Thus, it is the parking space to the front of the site that is the sole matter for consideration.

5. The site lies close to the junction of St Johns Hill and Monkton Road which is controlled by traffic lights and includes a pedestrian crossing. Double yellow lines follow the curve of the road and prohibit parking in close proximity of the junction, with other parking restrictions along Monkton Street in the form of solid white lines that mark out private drives that access onto the road. Directly outside of the appeal site is a parking space which sits between double yellow lines and a solid white line. At the time of my visit this space was occupied by two small cars. The highway at this point is used by large vehicles, which includes buses, and I have not been made aware of any size or weight restrictions on either St Johns Hill or Monkton Street.
6. The Council argue that the proposed parking space within the appeal site would not allow vehicles to enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thus, this could result in vehicles waiting on the junction of Monkton Road and St Johns Hill to reverse into the parking space, or indeed, reversing out onto Monkton Street. Furthermore, visibility to the south towards St Johns Hill is restricted and the creation of an additional access onto the highway at this point would add unduly to the hazards of highway users.
7. Additionally, given the site's proximity to the junction, the Council raise the concern that motorists turning into Monkton Street would not be expecting to see a vehicle reversing out of or into the space until they were very close to it. Moreover, there is a risk that vehicles reversing out of the proposed access may conflict with pedestrians using the adjacent crossing, some 7m to the south, and with vehicles waiting at the stop line on the opposite side of Monkton Street.
8. It is evident that as a result of the restricted space to the front of the dwelling, any vehicles parking at the site would be required to either reverse into the space or reverse out of the space onto Monkton Road. From other drives that I saw on Monkton Road, it is clear that motorists prefer to reverse into spaces. However, it was evident during my visit that as a result of the signalised crossing and junction, traffic passing the site does so at very slow speeds. This is a result of vehicles travelling south and cautiously entering the junction and from turning into the respective road, or as a result of being stopped by the traffic lights and starting from a standing position.
9. There are a number of properties that are in close proximity to the junction that have an access onto Monkton Road, which includes the neighbouring properties at Nos. 54, 55, 56 and 57. Although I acknowledge that the appeal site is closer to the junction than its neighbours, vehicles entering and exiting are unlikely to meet traffic that is moving at high speeds as a result of the relatively slow speeds as set out above. Moreover, as a result of the existing parking space, drivers are already likely to meet a vehicle parked on the road outside the appeal site and would need to take action accordingly. Furthermore, the addition of a single space within a row of properties that also have accesses onto Monkton Street is unlikely to translate into a large number of movements into and out of the appeal site.

10. With all the above factors in mind, I am not persuaded that the position of the appeal site in close proximity to the junction of St Johns Hill and Monkton Street would result in a danger to pedestrian safety and highway uses such that it would warrant withholding permission for the appeal proposal. Thus, the development would not result in harm to highway safety. It would not be in conflict with Policy DM2 of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy 2012 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that developments provide an accessible and safe built environment.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that I have considered in accordance with the Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. Along with the standard time condition, the approved plans should also be specified to provide certainty. In the interest of the visual amenities of the area, the materials to be used in the development shall also match the existing building.

Conclusion

12. Thus, for the above reasons, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR