



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1750/D/22/3294328

66 Church Road, Aldershot, Rushmoor, Hampshire GU11 3PS

- 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 A Banks against the decision of Rushmoor Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/00912/FUL, dated 25 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the formation of new driveway and vehicular access to highway for off street parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons

3. 66 Church Road (No.66) is a semi-detached residential property with the front garden area defined by a dwarf wall with fencing above. Currently the road in front forms part of a demarked parking space which extends in front of Nos.64, 66 and 68 and accommodates approximately 3 vehicles. To the other side is a bus stop and the road is marked with a single yellow line. Whilst Church Road is primarily residential, a short distance from the appeal site towards the junction with Lower Farnham Road are several shops.
4. Many properties along Church Road utilise the area to the front as a driveway with vehicles parked predominantly at a right angle to the road. The front garden area to No.66 is limited in depth and the application plan indicates that a parking space would be created parallel to the road. The width of the space is less than the dimensions of a parallel parking space (2.0m x 6.0m) set out in the Council's Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and which also indicates that widths may need to increase next to a wall and where the area also provides pedestrian access to a residential property an addition of a minimum 900mm is sought. Both scenarios apply to the appeal site.
5. The application plans show visibility splays and indicate that the dropped kerb would be located centrally. However, a vehicle would not be entering/exiting the parking space in a direct forward motion, nor is it clear from the plans if any of the on-road parking spaces to either side would be retained.

6. Given the limited size of the parking area and the various constraints, which includes access over a footpath and possible vehicles parked on the road, it is likely several manoeuvres would be required to park a vehicle as proposed. This would be contrary to the Highway Authority's guidance for dropped kerbs which explains that '*there must be no adjusting movements of a vehicle made on the highway when entering or exiting the property*'. The area falls significantly short of the width of 7.2m or more where the guidance indicates these restrictions may not apply. Additionally, the arrangements would result in the loss of at least one, but potentially more, on-street parking space(s) which are accessible and unrestricted, and thereby available to the occupiers of other properties and road users.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to similar parking arrangements along Church Road. Whilst I acknowledge that off-street parking is part of the character of the area there are differences in terms of the width/depth of frontages and the configurations with the neighbouring properties. Full details of the planning approvals for the crossovers referred to by the appellant are not before me, although these all pre-date the Council's SPD, and moreover, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.
8. I understand the appellant's desire for off-street parking, nonetheless, the front garden area to No.66 is of an insufficient size to accommodate the space required for parking and access to it would potentially interfere with other road users. The proposed arrangements do not accord with the Council's SPD and Highway Authority guidance, and fail to demonstrate that the safety of all highway users, including pedestrians, would be ensured. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Rushmoor Local Plan 2014-2032 policy IN2 which seeks appropriate design of parking provisions and suitable and safe access for all potential users.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR