

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2016

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/16/3155850

20 Winslow Road, Wingrave, Buckinghamshire HP22 4PS

- 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 Liam Laplain against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01325/APP, dated 1 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'to change existing garage into habitable residence for our client's elderly mother'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of existing garage into habitable accommodation at 20 Winslow Road, Wingrave, Buckinghamshire HP22 4PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01325/APP, dated 1 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 1:250 Site Location Plan, Revised Existing Floor Plan, Revised Existing Rear, Side and Front Plan 1 and 2, Revised Proposed Floor Plan dated 24 May 2016 and Revised Proposed Floor Plan dated 25 May 2016.
 - 3) The materials to be used in any works to the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have amended the description of development to accord with the Council's decision notice as this is a more accurate description and removes the reference to 'for our client's elderly mother', which is superfluous.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal results in adequate car parking provision and the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The existing garage is located to the rear of No. 20 Winslow Road, part of a two storey residential terrace of similar properties. The garage is accessed from a
-

block paved hard surface to the rear accessed directly from Parsonage Farm Road, a more modern residential development of two storey houses with off street parking.

5. It was evident from my visit that the garage was being used for domestic storage and not for the parking of a vehicle. Nevertheless, taking the existing dwelling and the proposal together, there would be a shortfall of two parking spaces compared with the Council's minimum standards as set out in its Parking Guidelines. Although the appellant contends the proposal will be used to assist in providing care for an elderly and disabled relative, I am also mindful that there is nothing before me to restrict occupancy of the conversion or car ownership of any future occupiers.
6. However, I saw that there are no on-street parking restrictions in place in the vicinity of the property and there is no evidence before me of any particular highway safety issues associated with on-street parking in this locality. I also note that the Highway Authority did not object to the proposal on highway safety grounds. One accessible and useable parking space would be retained for No. 20 and from my observations, albeit during the morning, on street parking did not appear to be at a premium. In my judgement, sufficient space for the likely future levels of vehicle ownership and movements associated with the property could be safely accommodated in the surrounding highway network.
7. For these reasons, the resultant parking provision would be adequate and would not harm highway safety. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy GP24 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan 2004 which, seeks to ensure that new development has safe access and parking in the interests of highway safety.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. A condition is required to ensure compliance with the approved plans as this provides clarity. Furthermore, a condition that external materials match the existing building is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR