



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/25/3363876

240 Sir Henry Parkes Road, Coventry CV4 8GG

- 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 Mr Stephen Mills of Swift Pave Ltd against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0000085/HHA.
 - The development proposed is dropped kerb for vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal was not submitted by the applicant as stated on the application form. However, the applicant has confirmed that Mr Stephen Mills of Swift Pave Ltd will conduct the appeal on their behalf. I am satisfied to progress the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end terrace dwelling that has a modestly sized front garden, similar to the other houses within the row of terrace properties. Along Sir Henry Parkes Road there are designated parking bays along the side of the road and generally, properties do not have driveways directly in front. As such, vehicles can be parked along the roadside for the length of the road.
5. The proposal seeks permission for a dropped kerb which would allow for parking directly in front of 240 Sir Henry Parkes Road (no 240). Given the narrow frontage of the property, it is unlikely that vehicles could turn around within the site to leave in a forward gear. As such, drivers would have to either reverse onto or off the driveway onto the road. As there are parking bays along the road, it is possible that these manoeuvres would take place with vehicles parked either side of the dropped kerb. Consequently, visibility would be hindered by parked vehicles and given that drivers would likely be undertaking manoeuvres in reverse their visibility would also be limited. This would be a hazardous manoeuvre due to obstructed visibility from parked vehicles.

6. Furthermore, if vehicles were being reversed onto the driveway, the pedestrian footway is between the parking bays and the dwellings and as such, parked vehicles may obstruct visibility between pedestrians and drivers. While the proposed development could, in certain circumstances, allow for additional vehicles to be parked and provide a private parking space for the appellant, this would not overcome the identified highway safety concerns that would arise from this proposal.
7. The appellant has identified several dropped kerbs that have been constructed nearby on the road. However, the planning permissions for those dropped kerbs were not provided, and the Council has identified that it did not have evidence that planning permission was granted for these. The Council also notes that it is possible that these were installed before the designated parking bays were laid out. Consequently, the concerns regarding visibility due to parked vehicles may not necessarily have been an issue at that time. Substantive evidence concerning accident data on the road has not been submitted and as such, I do not have evidence to identify whether manoeuvres undertaken via the existing dropped kerbs do or do not cause highway safety concerns. However, whilst other properties nearby may have dropped kerbs, each case must be considered on its own merits. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
8. Taking into consideration the road conditions, the development would create conflict between road users, particularly vulnerable ones such as pedestrians and no mitigation measures have been proposed to address this. As a result, the development would have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety and would conflict with Policies AC1, AC2 and AC4 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan. These policies state, amongst other matters, for new development proposals that are predicted to have a negative impact on safety of the highway network should mitigate and manage highway safety problems.

Other Matter

9. The appellants are required to attend hospital appointments, and the proposed development is identified as necessary for this purpose. However, it has not been demonstrated that the existing parking arrangements are inadequate for attending hospital appointments, or why these benefits depend on parking vehicles directly in front of the property.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Consequently, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR