



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/24/3356540

Holly Cottage, 50 High Street, Iver, Buckinghamshire SL0 9NG

- 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 Mrs Lesley Shaw against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application ref is PL/24/2353/FA.
 - The development proposed is described as: New vehicular crossover/dropped kerb, enabling direct vehicular access from High Street, Iver, into front garden of 50 High Street, Iver, for the purpose of parking 1 car.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety'.
4. The property is a semi-detached dwelling which has a small front garden. Immediately adjacent to the site is a zebra crossing.
5. The appellant has not demonstrated that the proposal makes any provision for visibility splays. These are required to demonstrate that as a vehicle leaves the site the driver can see other users of the public highway in time to prevent an accident. In addition, the depth of 4m of the proposed parking space will likely result in vehicles overhanging the public footpath. This overhang may put pedestrians at risk, as it may require pedestrians to step into the carriageway to move around a parked car. This risk is likely to be greater for more vulnerable people, such as those in a wheelchair or pushing a pram.
6. My attention has been drawn to other areas used for parking at the front of buildings in the area. These include 54A, 64D, 94, 96, 98 and 128 High Street, all of which I viewed at my site visit. However, I have not been provided with details of the circumstances of how each of these came to exist, or whether any of them are lawful at all. Moreover, from what I have seen, I am not satisfied they necessarily constitute safe examples of off-street car parking that should be replicated. So I give them limited weight in my decision.

7. I appreciate that the provision of a driveway may facilitate the charging of an electric vehicle and that this may be a benefit of the appeal scheme. But this does not outweigh the harm identified above.
8. The Council has referred to and provided copies of Policies CP12, CP8, EP3, EP5 and H11, the Iver Neighbourhood Plan. Policy H11(e) permits proposals to alter a dwelling only where 'satisfactory access and adequate off-street car parking would be provided, or retained on site'. However, it is noted that the Council has not concluded any harm against the Development Plan would arise, nor does it refer to Policies TR5 or TR7, as referred to in Policy H11(e). It has not been explained how the Development Plan policies are relevant to the main issue in the appeal, so they weigh neither in favour of nor against the proposal.
9. The Council has referred to the proposal not complying with Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance, due to the parking space not meeting the recommended 2.8m x 5.0m. The Council has also referred, though no additional detail has been provided, to the proposal's non-compliance with the Buckinghamshire Council Highways Development Management Guidance Document and the Framework. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety. As such, it would conflict with paragraph 116 of the Framework, noted above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR