



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/22/3306495

The Old Vicarage, 4 Church Street, Beckingham DN10 4PH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr C Wallhead against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00879/OUT, dated 4 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a proposed dormer bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 4 Church Street is an existing semi-detached dwelling in a residential area with a driveway to the side. The adjoining property lies immediately adjacent to a tight bend in the road. As a result, visibility from the existing driveway is severely limited in this direction. The bend is preceded by a similarly tight bend which together, cause vehicle speeds to be low in this location. The road is relatively narrow in places along the bend although widens as the road straightens out past the appeal site.
4. Traffic levels are light. I saw on the site visit that on-street parking levels were low with most properties having driveways with parking. However, it is likely that traffic levels and demand for on-street parking will be higher when functions or services are held at the adjacent All Saint's Church.
5. It is proposed to construct a new dwelling in the rear garden of the appeal site. This would be accessed via the existing driveway alongside the existing dwelling. This access would be widened and provided with a splayed entrance to improve visibility. However, the proposal would remove the off-street parking for the existing dwelling, increasing the likelihood of vehicles parked on the road. Indeed, the proposed plans state that parking for No 4 would be on the public highway.
6. In my experience, those visiting No 4 are likely to seek to park as close as possible to the dwelling. In order to avoid blocking the access to the new dwelling, this would lead to vehicles parking immediately outside the dwelling of No 4. When also taking into account the works proposed to widen the existing access, this would have the effect of shifting any on-street parking

closer to the bend. Vehicles negotiating the bend would likely stick to the left-hand side of the road as they have no view of any oncoming traffic. Notwithstanding the low vehicle speeds, the proximity of a parked car to the bend would limit forward visibility and allow drivers little time to respond, adversely affecting highway safety. This could increase the risk of a collision. The chances of such a collision would increase further when traffic levels rise as a result of events held at the adjacent church.

7. Although I accept that visibility levels from driveways here are generally low, a vehicle parked in the aforementioned position would further restrict visibility for drivers exiting the altered driveway. The increase in the likelihood of this occurring would adversely affect the safety of road users.
8. Notwithstanding the lack of planning control in this respect, I accept that future occupants of No 4 may be aware of the aforementioned risk to highway safety and may choose to park further away from the bend. However, that is less likely to be the case for visitors, including drivers of delivery vehicles. Indeed, whilst the appellant states that the parking previously took place on the road before the driveway was created, the lack of an access would have allowed past occupants to park further away from the bend. Notwithstanding that my role is to assess the effect on existing highway safety levels, I am not convinced that the previously existing on-street parking is comparable to what would result as from the proposed development.
9. I accept that there was good availability of on-street parking on my site visit and that the straight section of road here is reasonably wide. However, as set out above, my concern is the likely position in which a single vehicle, generated by No 4, would park. In this regard I would note that there are no controls available to me to prevent vehicles associated with No 4 parking on the public highway immediately outside that dwelling, close to the bend.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. It would therefore conflict with Bassetlaw Local Development Framework (2011) Policy DM4 which seeks to ensure developments provide accessibility to all and are not detrimental to highway safety. Conflict would also occur with paragraphs 110 and 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to ensure safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users and unacceptable impacts on highway safety are avoided.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR