



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3362029

8 Leighton Road, Sheffield S14 1SQ

- 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 Sacha Senior Swann against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application reference is 24/03717/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a parking space being created which would replace part of the front lawn of this property. The access would cross the grass verge and join the highway in an area of road that is used for on-street parking and as such, it is likely that there would, at times, be parked cars either side of the access. The access would be close to the junction with Norton Avenue which is a speed restricted dual-carriageway, A-Class road.
4. The depth of the front garden is not sufficient to accommodate many modern vehicles. It has been demonstrated that a medium sized hatch back car can fit within the available space provided it is parked very close to the wall of the house. A larger vehicle could not be accommodated. Whilst the appellant currently has a small car and intends to move to a similarly sized electric vehicle, this cannot be controlled through the planning process nor is it reasonable to limit the permission to the appellant. It has been demonstrated that the car can also be parked parallel to the front of the house but this would require manoeuvring over and along the pavement and considerable care would be required to avoid the neighbouring lawns and the grass verge.
5. As access to the parking space would at times be between parked vehicles, visibility when making reversing manoeuvres into the carriageway would be restricted, especially if large cars or commercial vehicles were parked. These manoeuvres would be into the carriageway at a point close to the junction where vehicles are leaving the dual-carriageway. Because of the generous curvature of the junction and its slip road, the geometry does not naturally reduce the speed of

vehicles to a very low level. The introduction of a reversing car, with limited visibility, between parked vehicles, at this particular point close to the junction, would undoubtedly add to road safety concerns. Intervisibility with pedestrians would currently be relatively good as the immediately adjacent neighbouring properties do not have garden fences. However, the potential for vehicles to overhang the pavement does add to my concerns.

6. The loss of this front garden and the verge to surfacing would detract from the appearance of this house. If repeated, this would significantly alter the character of this area, to its detriment. I am mindful also that the proposal, whilst providing a private parking space, would result in the loss of an on-street parking space, to the detriment of publicly available parking provision locally. Overall, the proposal would add to highway safety concerns and the unsatisfactory amount of space available would represent poor design, as would the replacement of the front lawn and verge with hard surfacing. It would therefore conflict with policy H14d of the Unitary Development Plan 1998 which requires safe access to the highway network. I also find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which seeks development that functions well and adds to the overall quality of the area.
7. The proposal would conflict with the council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Designing House Extensions 1996 due to the lack of depth of the parking space and also because the guidance seeks to avoid the removal of most or all of the planting in front gardens. As this document was adopted following consultation and it accords with the design expectations of the Framework, it can be afforded weight in the planning balance.
8. The appellant is seeking to use an electric vehicle which could be charged more economically and conveniently with an off-street parking space. This is a matter that offers weight in favour of the proposal and gains some support from the Framework. I have also had regard to the examples of parking on the grass verge and the associated highway safety concerns of parallel parking within the highway. However, on balance, the benefits of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR