



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday 15 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/21/3283659

579 Fletchamstead Highway, Coventry CV4 9EL

- 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 Gaurav Sharma against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/1403, dated 06 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a driveway.
-

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-terraced dwelling, located on the west side of Fletchamstead Highway. 579 Fletchamstead Highway is set back from the highway behind a front garden and brick wall boundary. Permission is sought for a driveway which would include a dropped kerb off Fletchamstead Highway, giving access to a permeable block paved driveway with a soakaway to the front of No 579. This would require the removal of the front garden and brick wall boundary.
4. The A45 Fletchamstead Highway is a busy classified road with a maximum speed limit of 40mph. The site is located at a point on the highway where there are 4 lanes of traffic heading north. At this point the traffic is also approaching a junction, which means that traffic will need to manoeuvre into the correct lane and therefore lane changing would be necessary. From my observations on site and having considered the response from the Highways Officer, it is clear to me that the proposal raises concerns about the ability of vehicles to enter and egress the site safely in a forward gear from the highway.
5. A vehicle slowing down to first gear to enter the proposed driveway would lead to vehicles behind it on the highway slowing down and even stopping while waiting for the vehicle to enter the driveway. I also consider that reversing out of the site onto the highway would be hazardous to both pedestrians and other road users. In addition, visibility would be restricted by the mature roadside trees and parked cars in the adjacent parking bay; this reduced visibility would be detrimental to highway safety.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in unsafe manoeuvring on the highway and would present a conflict with vehicles and pedestrian movement passing the site access because of vehicles obstructing the highway. I also conclude that visibility would be restricted due to vehicles parked in the adjacent parking bay and the mature roadside trees near the site entrance.
7. For the above reasons, I find the proposal would unacceptably harm highway safety. As such, it would not comply with policy AC2 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (adopted 2017), which amongst other things, seeks to ensure new developments do not cause unacceptable levels of highway safety.

Other Matters

8. I note the personal circumstances of the appellant and I acknowledge that there may be some benefits of providing on-site parking to the front of No 579, including the ease of accessing the property at night-time and the ability to charge an electric vehicle in a convenient location. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR