
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/W/16/3160447

2 Victoria Mews, West Green, Crawley RH11 7AB

- 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 Ms Abigail Monk against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2016/0444/FUL, dated 16 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'to convert the existing integral garage into a residential bed space. The house is a registered HMO and there is no parking provided for any residents.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed parking provision is acceptable and the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

3. There is an integral garage and single hardstanding area to the front of the property. A footway runs on one side of the Mews and single yellow lines are in place resulting in no space for on-street parking. In the adjoining street of Victoria Road, there are double yellow lines and resident only parking bays between the hours of 09:00 and 17:00 and in the wider locality on-street parking was limited.
4. The Council's minimum parking standards¹ require 0.5 spaces per unit and no parking spaces are provided under the Tenancy Agreement. Given the limited availability of on-street parking, there would be no safe and convenient parking spaces for what would be a 6 bedroom HMO, notwithstanding its location close to the town centre and space within the rear garden to store cycles.
5. I accept that the Tenancy Agreement states that parking is not provided and that the rooms are for single occupancy. The lack of parking provision however is solely the appellant's choice and this does not prevent occupants from owning a vehicle and is something which could not be controlled. Furthermore and on the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that future occupants

¹ Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2016.

would necessarily have a low car ownership rate and it is reasonable that there would also be guests and visitors who would arrive by car or other vehicles.

6. I also accept that the County Council, as highway authority have not objected to the proposal and that on-street parking controls exist during the day. In this particular case, given the existing parking situation, granting permission for an additional room without any off-street parking would cause inconvenience for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of other vehicles using the limited on street parking spaces within the locality and increase the risks of conflict between users which would harm highway safety.
7. For these reasons, the proposed parking provision would not be acceptable and this would cause harm to highway safety. The proposal would conflict with Policies H6, INV4 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 insofar as these require development to provide appropriate car parking to meets its needs in accordance with adopted standards and that such development can meet its operational parking requirements.

Other Matters

8. I accept that the proposal would increase the availability of this type of accommodation. However, I do not consider that the benefits of one additional bedroom outweigh the harm to highway safety that I have identified.
9. Whilst I note the appellant's reference to sustainable development with the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), the proposal would not accord with an up to date development plan. As such, it would not be the sustainable development for which the Framework indicates a presumption in favour.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan and having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR