



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/W/21/3287890

4 Sycamore View, Sheffield Road, Oxspring, Barnsley S36 8YW

- 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 Miss Chloe Lucas against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1335, dated 26 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2021
 - The development proposed is erection of front porch and creation of access to parking space to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of front porch and creation of access to parking space to front at 4 Sycamore View, Sheffield Road, Oxspring, Barnsley S36 8YW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/1335, dated 26 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed details of Front driveway & Porch – drawing ref. CL/01.
 - 3) The parking space hereby approved shall be surfaced in a solid bound material and adequate measures shall be so designed into the proposed facility to avoid the discharge of surface water from the site on to the highway.
 - 4) Pedestrian intervisibility splays having the dimensions 2m x 2m shall be safeguarded at the drive entrance/exit such that there is no obstruction to visibility at a height exceeding 600mm above the nearside channel level of the adjacent highway.

Procedural Matter

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the Council's decision notice which more concisely describes the proposal than the description given in part 3 of the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety and traffic flow.

Reasons

4. No.4 Sycamore Lane (No.4) is a two-storey end of terrace cottage which fronts Sheffield Road behind a small front garden currently laid with gravel. Sheffield Road is a classified road (B6462) which provides access to the A629 via either Bower Hill or Thurgoland Bank. At the time of my site visit, Thurgoland Bank was closed due to a landslide.
5. The appeal proposal is for the construction of a front porch extension and the creation of access to a car parking space to the front of No.4 from Sheffield Road. The Council have not raised any issue with the porch, their concern limited to direct access to a car parking space being taken from a classified road.
6. There is an existing dropped kerb to Sheffield Road and it is proposed to remove the existing low stone wall to the front of No.4 to allow access to a single car parking space to be finished in a permeable surface material. Because of the relatively narrow width of the frontage of No.4, there is not sufficient space for access and egress to be undertaken in a forward travelling direction. It will therefore be necessary to use Sheffield Road to manoeuvre.
7. I accept that classified roads are by their nature busier roads and I observed a reasonable level of traffic on my site visit (despite the closure of Thurgoland Bank). However, I also observed that this section of Sheffield Road is relatively straight over a significant distance and the visibility for drivers in both directions is therefore good. There is a vehicular access adjacent to No.4 to the rear of the Wagon and Horses Public House and it is proposed to lower the existing stone wall on the common boundary to below 900m to improve driver and pedestrian visibility from and towards the parking space. I also note that the Highways Authority is satisfied that 2m x 2m pedestrian intervisibility splays can be achieved, and the Council have suggested both of these are controlled by a planning condition.
8. There are a number of other examples of frontage parking with driveways directly onto this part of Sheffield Road, some without sufficient space for a vehicle to turn, including No.1 Sycamore View at the other end of the terrace of cottages. Whilst each proposal for parking falls to be considered on its own merits, the existence of this type of parking arrangement means that vehicle movements already occur on Sheffield Road. Further, parking is unrestricted on either side of the road and, at the time of my site visit, cars were parked outside Sycamore View. This caused vehicles to slow down, at or below the 30mph speed limit, when passing. It is therefore a location where you would reasonably expect drivers to anticipate vehicle movements and take extra care. Given this, and the good visibility for drivers and pedestrians, in my judgement, the proposed access to the car parking space would not cause harm to highway safety.
9. I acknowledge that it would be desirable for a vehicle to access and egress the proposed car parking space in a forward travelling direction and that traffic will likely be slowed (and possibly inconvenienced) by manoeuvring within Sheffield

Road. This occurrence would however be limited in frequency and duration and would not be to the detriment of the overall free flow of traffic.

10. Consequently, I find no conflict with the general principles in the *Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations (May 2019)* that house extensions and other domestic extensions should not, amongst other things, interfere with highway safety. Further, there would be no conflict with Policy T4 of the Barnsley Local Plan (January 2019) because the development will provide all transport users with safe and convenient access and movement.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawing as this provides certainty. As suggested by the Council, a condition requiring use of a solid bound material, measures to avoid surface water runoff, and the control of visibility splays is necessary in the interests of highway safety.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR