



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2020

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/20/3252742

2 Hazel Drive, Plymouth PL9 8PE

- 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 Mike Kerswill against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00334/FUL, dated 20 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed private motor garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would result in an appropriate level of car parking to serve a single dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, No 2 Hazel Drive, is a single storey dwelling with integral double garage that fronts onto the estate road. There is a driveway in front of the double garage, capable of accommodating at least two cars. In total, if the garages are used for the parking of vehicles, the property benefits from at least four parking spaces.
4. The appeal proposal seeks to introduce a detached double garage to the north-east of the property, in an area of garden currently planted with fruit trees and enclosed from the highway by a substantial brick wall. The proposal would also remove a section of the boundary wall and hardsurfacing would be laid to the front of the garage, providing an additional two parking spaces. From the evidence, it appears that the appellant's intention is to provide a store for a classic car in lieu of that provided by the existing garage which he intends to convert into accommodation for an elderly relative.
5. Policy DEV29 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 – 2034 (adopted 2019) (JLP) seeks to (3) ensure sufficient provision and management of car parking in order to protect the amenity of surrounding residential areas and ensure safety of the highway network; and (4) limit / control the overall level of car parking provision at employment, retail and other destination locations. The overarching aim of the Policy is to contribute positively to the achievement of a high quality, effective and safe transport system and promote sustainable transport choices.
6. The Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review (2013) (SPD) sets out in Table 8.1 that the maximum parking standards for

dwelling with two or more bedrooms is for two parking spaces. There is an absence of a requirement in JLP Policy DEV29 for the parking to be strictly limited as set out in the SPD. The SPD is also of an age and in respect of parking standards, does not appear to be supported by recent or compelling evidence that is otherwise required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework).

7. Though the increase in the number of parking spaces would not be certain to change the travel behaviour of the occupants and result in there being additional vehicle movements on the local road network, the overarching aims of the Development Plan are clear and the proposal would still remain beyond the current occupation of the dwelling in any case.
8. As such, on balance, given the surplus of spaces in relation to the number typically provided for a dwelling of such a size, the current proposal would result in an overprovision that would run counter to the aims of the Development Plan, specifically JLP Policy DEV29, which seeks to promote sustainable transport choices. For similar reasons, it would also conflict with the Framework.

Other Matters

9. I am mindful of the accommodation needs raised by the appellant but have limited evidence that works of this nature have progressed, or how they would affect the amount of parking or storage space. Additionally, there is little evidence to suggest that the appeal proposal is the only means of achieving the desired outcome.
10. The Council's case highlights potential harm to neighbouring amenity and quality of the built environment, although these aspects are not drawn out in any detail. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not considered these matters further.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

11. The appeal proposal conflicts with the Development Plan and there are no other considerations of sufficient materiality to outweigh the identified harm.
12. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR