



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2019

by Martin S. Lee, MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/18/3216193

137 Winchester Road, Basingstoke, RG21 8XR

- 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 Jon Heffernan against the decision of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01600/FUL, dated 1 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is change of use of from a three bed residential (C3 use) house to a six bed HMO (C4 use).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the change of use of from a three bed residential (C3 use) house to a six bed HMO (C4 use) at 137 Winchester Road, Basingstoke, RG21 8XR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 18/01600/FUL, dated 1 June 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No.DR-000 (Block and Location Plan); Drawing No.DR-005 Revision C (Proposed Floor Plans); Drawing No.DR-008B (Proposed Elevations) and Drawing No.DR-018 Rev A (Site Plan);
 - iii. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the 2 car parking spaces, 6 cycle parking spaces and manoeuvring facility shown on Drawing No. DR0018 Revision A have been fully provided. These spaces and the associated manoeuvring facility shall thereafter be maintained and kept available for their intended use at all times.

Preliminary Matters

2. As part of the appeal submissions the Appellant has submitted a revised internal building floor layout plan (Drawing number DR-005 Revision C), modifying access and layout for the ground floor communal shower room and Bedroom 2, addressing a discrepancy between the drawn proposals and the as-built situation evident during my internal inspection of the converted property. In deciding whether to accept this amended plan, I am mindful of the principles of the Wheatcroft case (Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd. v Secretary of State for the Environment and Another 1982). In this case, I note the plan reflects only a

minor internal alteration and the alterations have no bearing on the acceptability or otherwise of the appeal proposal and I have accepted the amended drawing as to do so would not prejudice the interests of any other parties.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on highway safety in the vicinity of the appeal site with particular regard to parking provision.

Reasons

4. The appeal scheme proposes the provision of two car parking spaces and six cycle parking spaces within the curtilage of the property. This level of provision does not meet the 1 car parking space per bedroom requirement for on-site parking referred to as the standards required within the Basingstoke and Deane Parking Supplementary Planning Document July 2018 (SPD).
5. Where proposals do not meet the stated standards, the SPD allows for a parking assessment to be undertaken in order to determine whether displaced off-site parking would be likely to create significant highway safety issues or parking stress as a result of increased demand in the vicinity. A parking assessment was provided with the application which concludes that there is capacity within the surrounding road network where the notional shortfall of four car parking spaces could reasonably be accommodated.
6. Although the Council have observed that, at times, parking on grass verges occurs in addition to on-street parking, it has not submitted any substantive evidence that would contradict the appellant's parking survey. Whilst any additional on-street parking arising from the appeal proposal would increase the demand for parking spaces in the area, the levels would not reach the 85% threshold where severe parking stress would occur. During my early afternoon visit I observed spaces available on a number of the roads in the immediate vicinity of the site, reinforcing the appellant's parking survey data. I acknowledge that what I observed was just a snapshot at that time but have no reason to believe that it wasn't a typical day.
7. The proposals provide individual cycle parking for each proposed resident in addition to the two car parking spaces proposed. This area is accessible by car, as evidenced by the pre-existing domestic car garage on site at the time of my visit, in addition, the site is in a location where road access to services and employment would support active cycle use. I consider the evidence of parking capacity within the surrounding highway network robust and, therefore, taking account of the level of on-site provision for cycle parking in addition to the car parking proposed, find the balance of on-site provision and off-site capacity sufficient to mitigate any potential adverse highway safety impact.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to highway safety in the vicinity of the appeal site with particular regard to parking provision. It would comply with the relevant requirements of Policies CN9 and EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029, the Basingstoke and Deane Parking Supplementary Planning Document July 2018 and the advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. When read together, the development plan and the Framework expect new development to provide appropriate parking provision in accordance with the adopted parking standards,

not compromise highway safety and promote alternative means of transport to the private car.

Conditions

9. 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. A further condition is also required to ensure the proposed parking provision is made and retained for the level of use hereby authorised. I have combined conditions on cycle and car parking spaces and manoeuvring facilities to make it clear that all must be provided as a single combined facility to provide not only the requisite parking but also the necessary facilities for manoeuvring to enable exit from the property in forward gear required to service those spaces.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
11. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Martin S. Lee

INSPECTOR