



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/24/3351707

48 The Scotchill, Keresley, Coventry CV6 2EX

- 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 Mrs Pinki Virdee against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref: PL/2024/0001136/HHA dated 18 June 2024 was refused by notice 8 August 2024.
 - The application is for dropped Kerb outside property. Garden block paved which has already been completed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the safe and efficient use of the highway.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid terrace, bow fronted house within The Scotchill which is characterised by many such houses of similar design characteristics. A now all too common feature of the area is the plethora of frontage car parking and hardstanding to many properties along this and other neighbouring roads. Although there is technically the possibility of parking to the rear, the access to such space appears cramped and, I saw on my site visit, that it is gated.
4. The property has already removed any such garden or landscape features that may once have existed and now the frontage of both this property and its neighbours, is one of hardstanding for the use of parking vehicles. The proposal before me seeks to further regularise this situation through the provision of a dropped kerb to allow easier access into the front of the site.
5. The Council have resisted this application largely due to the busy ness of The Scotchill which is a classified road. Indeed, I saw on my site visit that not only does the street accommodate on street parking, but it also experiences high volumes of traffic, some of which travels at high speeds.
6. In assessing this appeal therefore I note that the situation of frontage parking already exists for several houses along this stretch of road, including that of the appeal site. Several such houses also have dropped kerbs as illustrated by

the Appellant. However, the safety of the highway must be given paramount consideration in such a scheme.

7. The Council have suggested that one reason for their refusal was the inability of the Appellant to control the generally required visibility splays to the frontage. I saw on my site visit that there are no such obstacles to visibility along this stretch other than that of a low brick wall and other parked vehicles farther away from the site. Moreover, when vehicles park on the roadside they appeared, on my visit at least, to mount the kerb anyway. As such I cannot concur with the Council that levels of visibility would be impeded.
8. However, visibility on approaching in a forward gear is one matter. Exiting or entering the property frontage in reverse is quite another. In this respect, there would be an inability, or very low likelihood of the users of this space to go to the effort of turning a vehicle within the limited area available so as to allow them to exit in a forward gear. Due therefore to the fast moving traffic and pedestrian movements along this stretch, I am unable to see how it would be safe for a driver to reverse from this site in complete safety either for themselves or other road users, including those more vulnerable users.
9. As such, in regularising this situation I consider that there would be a real and tangible risk to highway safety. As a result, this proposal would fail to meet the criteria within Policies AC2 and AC4 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 which seek to protect the safe and efficient use of the highway and as such the appeal must fail.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR