
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2025

by C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/25/3363887
23 Heath Crescent, Coventry CV2 4PR

- 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 Swift Pave Ltd against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0000343/HHA.
 - The development proposed is dropped kerb for vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dropped kerb for vehicular access at 23 Heath Crescent, Coventry CV2 4PR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/0000343/HHA, subject to the following conditions:
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: Site Plan and Block Plan, Ref Nos. TQRQM25050104415571.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development has been taken from the application form, although the proposed plans also show an area of permeable block paving to form a driveway in front of the dwelling house, included as part of the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

4. There are on-street parking bays along Heath Crescent on the appeal site side of the road, with double yellow lines preventing on street parking on the opposite side of the road. In front of the appeal site the road traffic speed is 30mph, which reduces to a 20mph zone further along Heath Crescent on approach to a nearby school. At the time of my appeal site visit, on a midweek morning, there were a number of vehicles parked along Heath Crescent within the designated on-street parking bays. However, I observed that there was availability of on street parking spaces nearby, including along Heath Crescent and the side roads leading off it.
5. Most dwellings along this part of the road, near to the appeal site, do not have off-street parking spaces in front, although there are a few examples with frontage driveway parking, including at 24 and 25 Heath Crescent (No 24 and No 25). While No 25 does not have a dropped kerb access to its off street parking space, No 24

does. Therefore, even if this access is unlawful, it is an existing formal dropped kerb which is currently in use and no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate it has caused highway safety issues. Also, on the other side of the appeal site, there is an existing dropped kerb providing access to a long driveway leading to land and buildings at the rear of dwellings. Such dropped kerb accessways either side of the appeal site would mean that vehicles would not be able to park on the road immediately adjacent to the proposed. Therefore, there would be some vehicular visibility either side of the access.

6. The boundary fence between the appeal site and No 24 would likely restrict pedestrian visibility from the proposed driveway. Also, there is a hedge around No 22 Heath Crescent, set further away from the appeal site, which the local highway authority assert would restrict visibility from the proposed access. However, the proposed access arrangement and visibility therefrom would not be that different to, if not better than, that of vehicles leaving the existing driveways either side of the appeal site. Furthermore, in view of the nearby points of access and other street features, including on street parking, it is likely that pedestrians and drivers would be more alert to potential conflict around the appeal site.
7. Therefore, in view of the above, including the lack of evidence of highway incidents at other points of access nearby, it is unlikely the proposed access and its use associated with one dwelling would cause unacceptable harm to highway safety. This is even if there would be insufficient visibility caused by parked cars further along the road, particularly when vehicles reverse off the proposed driveway.
8. Even though the proposal would involve the loss of one on-street parking space in front of the appeal site, which currently has unrestricted public usage, this space would be displaced within the appeal site. In view of such and the availability of on street parking spaces nearby, the loss of one unrestricted on-street space would not cause undue pressure on parking in the local area.
9. Having regard to the above, on balance, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on highway and pedestrian safety and so, there would be no conflict with Policies AC1, AC2 and AC3 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (December 2017), which amongst other matters, require new development to mitigate and manage any negative impacts on the capacity and/or safety of the highway network, consider the accessibility needs of everyone and make provision for appropriate parking.

Conditions

10. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance, in addition to the standard implementation condition, it would be necessary in the interests of certainty to define the plans with which the scheme should accord.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal would accord with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate otherwise. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR