



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **C Evans MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/25/3373173

152 Strines Road, Strines, Stockport SK6 7GA

- 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 Sarah Harper against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/095560.
 - The development proposed is levelling of the front garden and creation of driveway to the front with side access steps, robust wooden fence rail, visibility mirror and dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The above description of development is taken from the decision notice and Section E of the appeal form. This is more concise than the wording used on the application form and accurately describes the proposal.
3. I noted at my site visit that development resembling that shown on the submitted plans was already taking place, consisting of the construction of a retaining wall and works to create a new block paved area in front of this wall. For the avoidance of doubt, my decision is based on the proposals shown on the plans.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on highway safety; and
 - whether there are other material considerations sufficient to outweigh any harm identified in respect of the first issue.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached property located on Strines Road (the B6101). The surrounding area is predominantly residential. Properties are generally set back from the highway, separated by either private driveways or gardens. My site visit took place around midday on a weekday. At this time, Strines Road was reasonably busy, with regular breaks in the traffic.
6. The proposed driveway would be 6.6m wide and 4.8m deep. The depth falls short of the 5.0m outlined in para 3.6.12.1 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Transport and Highways in Residential Areas. Although the parking spaces would exceed the Manual for Streets recommendation of 4.2m for parking

- of this nature, they would be unable to accommodate a lot of modern cars without those vehicles overhanging the already narrow pavement. This would force pedestrians to step into the road, compromising their safety.
7. No turning facility is provided as part of the proposal, due to the limited size of the proposed hardstanding. The appellant has provided photographs of other driveways and accesses in the local area which lack turning facilities. However, I do not know the age or background to these, and whether any of them required planning permission. Their existence does not justify the creation of an unsatisfactory access.
 8. I note that the appellant has stated that they will reverse onto the drive, enabling them to join Strines Road in a forward gear. However, other drivers, including future occupiers and visitors to No 152 may not honour this arrangement, resulting in vehicles reversing onto Strines Road. This would increase the risk of collision and thereby compromise highway safety.
 9. The Council estimates that visibility splays are approximately 2.4m by 7.0m. The appellant has not provided their own distances, neither have they disputed the figures supplied by the Council. I have therefore, relied on the Council's evidence. The distances cited are significantly less than the stopping distances recommended in the Manual for Streets. The resulting substandard visibility would mean that users of the access would have insufficient warning of oncoming vehicles.
 10. I agree with the appellant that this section of Strines Road is generally straight with good visibility. They suggest that a low height boundary treatment could be required via a planning condition to aid visibility. However, they do not give details regarding the resulting change to visibility splays and therefore I cannot be certain that this would create an acceptable level of visibility. The proposal also includes the installation of a visibility mirror. Whilst this may provide some additional visibility for users of the proposed driveway, it would not be effective in creating a safe and suitable access.
 11. The appellant contends that the proposal would result in betterment through improvements for vulnerable road users, a reduced sense of enclosure for pedestrians and less reliance on on-street parking. However, these benefits do not outweigh the unacceptable impacts on highway safety that would be caused by the proposal.
 12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed driveway would have a harmful effect on highway safety. It would conflict with Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 Policy T-3 Safety and Capacity on the Highway Network. This requires development that has an adverse impact on the safety of the highway network to be sufficiently mitigated and for design and access arrangements to be safe, practical and well designed. The proposal would also conflict with Policy SIE-1 Quality Places, which seeks to ensure the safety and security of users and Policy CS9 Transport and Development, which requires proposals to consider the needs of the most vulnerable road users.

Other Matters

13. The current parking arrangements for No 152 are causing safety concerns surrounding a disabled family member. Accordingly, I have had regard to the Public

Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires me to consider the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Disability is a protected characteristic.

14. Although the proposed driveway would assist with providing a safer pedestrian access for the disabled family member, it would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, which cannot be overcome by imposing planning conditions. This would put the occupiers of No 152 and other road users at unacceptable risk of harm. It is necessary and proportionate to dismiss the appeal.

Conclusion

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

C Evans

INSPECTOR