



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2009

by **Edward A Simpson JP BA(Hons)**
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:
23 November 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/D/09/2114555/WF
3 Leswell Street, Kidderminster, DY10 1RP

- 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 Mr T Spillsbury against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 09/0544/FULL, dated 27/07/09, was refused by notice dated 22/09/09.
- The development proposed is two storey and single storey side extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would result in an unacceptable increase in hazard to pedestrians and other road users, or an undesirable increase in on-street parking.

Reasons

3. The depth available for parking a car off the highway would be reduced to some 3.35m. Not only is this much less than the depth of a normal end-access parking bay of some 4.8m, but a vehicle parked in front of the extension would seriously impede access to the dwelling. There is clearly a risk that a vehicle parked here, even a medium sized car, would overhang the pavement and cause an unacceptable hazard to pedestrians. In this regard I noted the close proximity of the appeal site to a main access to St.Ambrose Primary School. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with Policy TR.9 of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan which aims to promote highway safety.
4. I also noted at the time of my site visit (mid-morning) that there was a strong demand for on-street parking in Leswell Street and virtually all available space was occupied. Failure to continue to provide an off-street parking space at no.3 would place undesirable extra pressure on the available on-street parking provision. This is a further factor which weighs against the appeal proposal. Failure to provide off street parking would also conflict with policy TR.17.
5. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E A Simpson

Inspector