



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/24/3358231

46 Askern Road, Carcroft, Doncaster DN6 8DE

- 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 Miss Natasha Reid against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00187/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a vehicle dropped crossing installed to allow vehicles to be parked down the side and front of my property.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The description above is taken from the application form and whilst it varies from the decision notice, the difference is not fundamental. The ability of any party to make their case in respect of the appeal scheme would not be prejudiced by me referring to it in these terms. At the time of my site visit, there was no dropped kerb but vehicles were parked within the appeal site. I have considered the effect of the proposed drop kerb in regard to highway safety, which is the main issue of the appeal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is on the B1220 and close to the point where the speed limit increases. It is towards the end of Askern Road, sitting alongside a junction leading to a business park. At the time of my site visit, there were several cars parked partly on the B1220 and the pavement. The property benefits from a narrow access to the side that leads to the rear.
5. The proposal would introduce a dropped kerb to the front of the site that would formalise an arrangement for the parking of vehicles within the appeal site which appears to have been taking place for some time. Due to the amount of space between the front of the appeal site and the roadside pavement there would be insufficient in site turning space to always ensure a forward manoeuvre in and out without obstructing the pavement. To the rear of the property there is limited space available due to the location of a shed, planting and other domestic paraphernalia

that takes up a substantial part of the rear garden which would thus restrict the amount of turning space available there. I therefore remain to be convinced, in the absence of, for example, a swept path analysis, that a vehicle parking within the site either to the front or the back, would be able to enter and exit the site in forward gear. Any vehicle parking on the site would therefore have to enter or exit backwards.

6. Should a driver be reversing into the road, their field of vision would be hindered by the direction of travel. This increases the likelihood of conflict between them and a vehicle or a pedestrian. The same effects would arise with a vehicle reversing into the site, with the added impedance to the free flow of traffic when a vehicle would stop in the carriageway to commence the manoeuvre. This would be exacerbated by the busy nature of the road and how close vehicles would be to the access to the nearby business park.
7. The proposed development would therefore give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would thus be at odds with Policies 13 and 42 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2021 (LP) which are concerned with road safety amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. Policy 41 of the LP appears to be concerned with character which does not appear to be a contentious matter for the appeal or directly relevant to the main issue. I have not therefore referred to it in my conclusions against the development plan.
9. I have not been provided with any specific accident data that would justify the harm to highway safety that I have identified above. Furthermore, accidents that have taken place on the road are alleged to be due to its busy nature and therefore further demonstrate why a vehicle manoeuvring therein and where the driver has limited visibility could give rise to the increased potential for additional vehicle collisions. The information therefore does not change my findings.
10. There is a shared vehicular access to the rear of the site which has not been included within the red outline of the appeal site. I have therefore not referred to this access within my reasoning above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR