St Roy

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2008

by D Grace BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
14 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/A/08/2069903
20 Elm Grove, Worthing BN11 5LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Patrick O'Byrne against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref. WB/07/1053/FULL, dated 20 August 2007, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2007.
- The development proposed is a crossover.

Decision

1. For the reasons given below, **I dismiss the appeal**.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on road safety and convenience for users of Elm Grove.

Reasons

3. The front part of the appeal property appeal property was formerly a hairdressing premises but has recently been converted for residential use. The proposed development is described in the application as a crossover. The application plan identifies this as a vehicle access and shows currently garden land in front of the appeal property as a proposed hardstanding. This could be used for vehicle parking and the appellant's grounds of appeal make it clear that this is the intention. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

4. Elm Grove is a classified road that links the A259 and A2031 roads. The appeal site is adjacent to the junction of Elm Grove and The Drive. Elm Grove First School is directly opposite. The school frontage that faces the appeal site has two vehicle access/egress points and a pedestrian entrance. I accept that, as a result of the presence of the school, the number of pedestrian movements in this part of Elm Grove is significantly greater than would be normally expected in a residential street.

5. I have not been provided with specific information in respect of road traffic accident records. Nonetheless, as a result of the combination of vehicle turning movements at the nearby road junction and into and out of the school and the high level of pedestrian movements and dropping off and picking up of children by car at the school, I consider this is a location where there is a relatively high potential for conflict between the various types of highway users.

6. The proposed hardstanding in front of No.20 would be too small to allow a vehicle to be turned off-road. Therefore, it is likely that there would be

occasions when vehicles would be reversed from it on to the highway. I consider this would add to road safety hazards and interruptions to the flow of traffic at this focal point in the street. In view of the existing relatively high risk of conflicts between the various types of highway users, I conclude on the main issue that, as a result of this increase in hazards, the proposed development would unacceptably harm road safety and convenience for users of Elm Grove and would conflict with Policy DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016.

7. The appellant considers the proposed crossover would discourage on-street parking in front of the appeal property and opposite the school and that this would have road safety benefits. However, I am not convinced that this would necessarily be the case at school drop-off and pick-up times when the pressure for very short stay on-street parking would be greatest and when the road safety risks for pedestrians would be at their peak.

8. I note that there are a number of other accesses nearby that facilitate off-road vehicle parking in front of dwellings. However, only one of those in the terrace of which the appeal building is a part, at No.24, is the subject of planning permission and that permission was granted ten years ago. Moreover, the appeal property is nearer to the junction of Elm Grove and The Drive where there is a greater risk of conflict between road users. In any event, the appeal proposal falls to be considered on its own planning merits and I consider my conclusion on the main issue is the determining matter in this appeal.

9. I have considered all other matters raised, including the benefits of the scheme in terms of parking convenience for the occupiers of the property, but find nothing leads me to a different overall conclusion.

D Grace

INSPECTOR