
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2017

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/16/3156218

6 Wood View Mews, Romford, RM1 4PN

- 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 & Mrs Holdstock against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0527.16, dated 4 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is external alteration and use of garage as home office pursuant to conditions 5 and 8 of planning permission P1746.07
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 8 February 2017.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for external alteration and use of garage as home office pursuant to conditions 5 and 8 of planning permission P1746.07 at 6 Wood View Mews, Romford, RM1 4PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0527.16, dated 4 April 2016, subject to the conditions in Annex A.

Background and Main Issue

2. No 6 Wood View Mews is located within a group of dwellings granted planning permission in 2007¹. The planning consent removed permitted development rights. In particular a condition was imposed that restricted the use of the garage. Accordingly the main issue is the effect of the change of use of the garage to home office on highway safety.

Reasons

3. No 6 is a two storey town house located within a gated private road. It currently has two off street parking spaces. If the garage were to be converted then the property would have one parking space remaining in the area in front of the garage. The Council identify that the site is located in a suburban area which is described as 'rest of the borough...' for the purposes of the application of policy. This would require provision of between 2 and 1.5 parking spaces. The Council's report identifies that considered against the requirement of DC33 of the of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document there would be a deficiency of 1 space. Therefore I consider

¹ LPA ref P1746.07

whether the proposal would result in significant on street parking that would lead to harm to highway safety.

4. Woodview Mews is a private road and does not have any parking restrictions. The Council report identifies that it is a shared surface. It is suggested that for this reason on street parking would cause an obstruction. However, the amount of parking that would be required to meet the standard would be low at 1 space. The parking bays and garages for remaining dwellings in the Mews would not be affected. In addition there are alternative means of transport available. In particular the appellant points out that it is a short walk to the bus stop and it would be possible to cycle or get a bus to the station.
5. Overall the level of on street parking required would be low. The level of availability of on plot parking for other dwellings suggests to me that there is unlikely to be significant pressure on the Mews road for additional parking. In addition the location of the dwelling would allow access to alternative means of transport. As such the occupiers of the dwelling would not be wholly reliant upon the car. Therefore should existing or future residents have an additional car then it is unlikely that there would be a significant pressure on on road parking.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway safety. It would not be in conflict with DPD policies DC32 and DC33 in so far as they seek to resist schemes that would have an adverse impact on the road hierarchy, set out that parking provision within development should not exceed the maxima and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which is clear that development should only be prevented on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts would be severe.

Conditions and Conclusion

7. The Council has suggested three conditions in the event that I allowed the appeal. I have considered these in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Conditions are necessary regarding commencement and plan numbers. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition to secure appropriate materials is also necessary in this case.
8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR

Annex A – 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: HS/16/JW/000; HS/16/JW/001; HS/16/JW/002; HS/16/JW/003; HS/16/JW/004; HS/16/JW/005; HS/16/JW/101; HS/16/JW/104; HS/16/JW/105; Ordnance Survey map.
- 3) All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.