



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2024

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/24/3344857

26 New Road, Brading, Sandown, Isle of Wight, PO36 0AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Trevor Bartlett against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00441/HOU.
 - The development proposed is for the formation of vehicular access and hardstanding.
-

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 property fronts onto New Road which is an 'A' classified road (A3055) and forms part of the Island's main road network. New Road is subject to a 30mph speed limit and in the vicinity of the appeal site parking is prohibited on both sides of the road.
4. There are a number of dwellings with vehicle crossovers and on-site parking along this stretch of New Road. This includes the adjacent dwelling at 28 New Road (No.28) and the dwelling at 30 New Road (No.30). However, these parking spaces appear to be long established; do not involve parallel parking; and visibility from the crossovers is superior to that of the proposal.
5. Further to the south along the A3055 there are a number of both on-street and off-street parallel parking spaces, which similarly appear long established. The majority are located immediately adjacent to the carriageway or within the highway where visibility of and from the spaces is reasonable. However, there are also a number of parking spaces with poor visibility. Rather than set a precedent the existing on-site parking spaces reinforce the need to assess each proposal in its individual merits and in accordance with the prevailing planning policies.
6. The appeal dwelling comprises a detached house with a shallow front garden that is separated from the highway by a brick wall. This wall continues along part of the frontage to No.28 and there is a similar brick wall along the front boundary of 24 New Road (No.24).

7. Together and amongst other things policies DM11 & SP7 of the Island Plan Isle of Wight Core Strategy (2012) (CS), expect proposals to provide functional, accessible, safe and adaptable built environments and that they should not negatively impact on the strategic road network. Paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework), states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
8. Manual for Streets/Manual for Streets 2 advise that the point at which a visibility splay should be measured should normally be set back 2.4 metres from the 'give-way' line and the distance is normally measured along the centre line of the minor arm for simplicity. However, in some circumstances, for example where there is a wide splitter island on the minor arm it will be more appropriate to measure it from the actual driver. It goes on to state that a lesser distance of 2 metres may be considered in lightly trafficked and slow-speed situations, although using this value would mean that the front of some vehicles would protrude slightly into the carriageway. The ability of drivers and cyclists to see this overhang from a reasonable distance and to manoeuvre around it without due difficulty should be considered.
9. The appeal property fronts onto a straight stretch of the A3055, which forms part of the Island's main road network, as well as being the main vehicle route through Brading. It forms part of a bus route within the settlement and is one of the pedestrian and vehicular routes to the railway station. Accordingly, having regard to the location of the appeal site, it is not a location where visibility splays could reasonably be relaxed without compromising highway safety.
10. It is clear from the submitted drawings that standard visibility splays of 2.4 metres (X distance) x 59 metres (Y distance) in both directions would not be provided. As stated by the council the visibility splays would be restricted to approximately 2.4 metres x 10 metres. However, this is not the end of the matter, as the visibility splays shown on the council's Section 171 License application form documentation relate to a car parked perpendicular to the road. Thus, although the required Y distance relates to safe stopping distances for approaching traffic, the x distance does not factor in the visibility for drivers exiting from a parallel parking space.
11. With the proposal the entire front boundary wall to the appeal property would be removed and a parallel parking space would be created within the front garden. The proposed vehicular visibility towards and from the parked vehicle would be severely restricted by the adjacent walls and planting whilst the vehicle was fully positioned within the parking space.
12. To achieve the required Y distances of 59 metres would involve manoeuvring onto and obstructing the pavement. From the submitted visibility splay drawings, which show a vehicle parked facing north, it is clear that subject to the size of the vehicle this could involve vehicles encroaching across the entire depth of the pavement. Also, due to the angle that the vehicle would need to exit the parking space, when stopped on the pavement visibility to the right would be restricted. Drivers would need to either look behind them or potentially adjust their rear view mirrors. The same situation would occur in reverse with parked vehicles that face south, with the added highway

constraints posed by the proximity of the junction of New Road and Station Gardens.

13. For this reason, the proposal would fail to provide adequate and safe vehicular visibility splays and would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This harm would clearly outweigh the benefits for the appellant of having an on-site parking space with an on-site car charging point and the associated reduced pressure for on-street parking in the immediate area. Further, this is not a matter that could be satisfactorily dealt with through the imposition of planning conditions.
14. The appellant has quoted from the Islands Roads web site, which states that a parallel parking space should be 6 metres long and 3 metres wide. However, the council has indicated that this dimension relates to parallel parking spaces sited adjacent to unclassified roads. Parallel parking spaces served by classified roads should be 3.5 metres wide and 8 metres deep. As shown on the drawings included in the Islands Roads consultation response a 3.5 x 8 metre parallel parking space would facilitate the manoeuvring and parking of a 4.8 metre long car. It also shows that it would enable vehicles to be parked well within the parking area, where car doors would not be opened directly onto the pavement.
15. The proposed parking space would be some 8.3 metres long and would range between 3 and 3.5 metres wide. The appellant's swept path drawings show a slightly shorter vehicle than shown on the council's swept path drawings and that the vehicle would be parked immediately adjacent to the pavement. Whilst the slightly longer length of the proposed parking bay would partly compensate for the narrower width of part of the parking bay, overall, I find that the bay would be too small for its location adjacent to a Class A road. This exacerbates my concerns regarding the inadequate visibility that would be provided to serve the proposed on-site parking space and associated vehicular crossover.
16. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Accordingly, it would conflict with CS Policies DM11 and SP7.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR