The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2018

by D Child BA BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/18/3208418
131 Goldthorpe Green, Goldthorpe, Rotherham S63 9EL

- 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 Jacob Birkby against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2018/0524, dated 23 April 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2018.
- The development proposed is described as change front yard into driveway.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

3. Goldthorpe Green is part of the B6098, which is an arterial route from the A635 running through Goldthorpe and Bolton upon Dearne. The appeal site comprises the front garden to No 131 Goldthorpe Green, a dwelling which fronts the B6098 behind a red brick wall. A bus shelter is sited adjacent to the wall. The development would see the front garden paved and a section of the front boundary wall removed, to form a vehicular access with the B6098. The access would be opposite the busy Goldthorpe Medical Centre.

4. The B6098 in the location of the appeal site is relatively wide and the subject of a 30 mph speed limit. Speed enforcement cameras are situated to the south of the appeal site, on the approach to a bend in the carriageway just before the proposed access. Nonetheless, at my visit I saw that on the bend and past the appeal site vehicle speeds were relatively high.

5. Whilst the footway is wide and the bus stop is sited at the back edge of it, the bus stop restricts forward visibility in a north easterly direction. The bend in the highway southwest of the access limits forward visibility in a south westerly direction. In addition, I am not convinced from the appeal plans and what I saw at my visit that a vehicle could satisfactorily turn within the appeal site, so as to enter and leave in a forward gear. This would mean vehicles reversing out of the site close to the bend, and where the bus stop restricts forward visibility opposite the busy medical centre access. The combination of these factors leads me to conclude that the proposed access would be harmful to highway safety.

6. Accordingly, the development would be contrary to Policy CSP26 of the Barnsley Core Strategy (September 2011), which amongst other things requires that new development will be expected to be designed and built to provide safe, secure and convenient access for all road users. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 108 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2018), which amongst other things states that it should be ensured that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users.

Other Matters

7. The appellant states that currently they park opposite the site at the doctor's surgery car park and that this is not ideal. I have considered the benefits the driveway would bring to the appellant's growing family. However, this does not outweigh the harm to highway safety.

Conclusion

8. The appeal scheme would be harmful to highway safety. As a result it would not accord with the development plan or the NPPF. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

D Child

INSPECTOR