



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/W/20/3249203 391 Purbrook Way, Havant PO9 3SE

- 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 A Howe against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: APP/19/00214 dated 18 February 2019 was refused by notice dated 28 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is following demolition of existing outbuilding construction of 2 bedroom dwelling with associated soft and hard landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. It is not clear to me from the information before me whether the proposal would be intended to be a car free development; the considerations appear to relate to whether or not the possibility of cars associated with the new house could be satisfactorily parked on-street. Furthermore, no mechanism has been provided to indicate how a car free housing development might be secured, particularly as this is not part of a controlled parking zone. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that the proposed dwelling would rely on on-street parking.
3. The Council's reason for refusal is specific to this matter and no other issues are raised regarding the principle of or the details of the proposed dwelling. From all the material in front of me and my site visit I have no reason to take a different view. I consider that the proposal would be in a sustainable location and would respect the character and appearance of the local area.
4. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on on-street car parking in the local area, to protect the amenities of future occupiers and surrounding residents.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is the side garden to an end of terrace, two storey dwelling which sides on to the southern side of Purbrook Way, within a predominantly residential area with mainly short terraces of housing dating from a similar period. Purbrook Way is a busy road and a bus route. Most of the houses do not have off-street parking and there is on street parking on both sides of Purbrook Way, including outside the appeal site.

6. The proposal would extend the host property to create a new 2 bedroom dwelling to follow the scale and appearance of the rest of the terrace, with a garden to the rear and to the side. As the existing house and garden is at a higher level than the street, there is no opportunity to provide off-street parking. I agree that the site appears to be well located in terms of accessibility to local facilities and on a bus route. However, this would not necessarily mean that future occupiers would not also own one or more cars that would need to park on the street.
7. I agree with the Council that the lack of parking availability in a reasonably close distance to a home is an issue which can, as stated in the Council's Parking Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD), lead to amongst other matters, street congestion, road safety issues or create tensions within a community (paragraph 1.01). There is conflicting evidence in front of me as to how difficult it may be for local residents to find a parking space reasonably close to their home. Although a parking survey was undertaken which shows the availability of spaces, this contradicts the evidence provided by local residents who have lived in the local area for many years, as well as the Council officer's own assessment, which, taken together, indicate a worsening position with a lack of available parking spaces at certain times of the day to meet the demand for parking from local residents.
8. Furthermore, the details of the survey undertaken by the Appellant do not appear to cover a wholly representative period of each day, extending particularly into the later evening as well as very early morning when potentially there is the greatest demand for parking. In addition, some of the photos, as well as showing the availability of spaces, appear also to show cars parked in locations which could suggest a lack of availability of spaces in the on-street parking bays.
9. Whilst I accept that the proposal would potentially only lead to a demand for a modest number of parking spaces, I am not satisfied on the basis of the information provided that this would not lead to an unacceptable worsening of the existing parking situation leading to material harm to the amenities of future occupiers and neighbouring residents. This would conflict with Policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular paragraph 127 f) all of which seek a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

Planning Balance

10. Paragraph 59 of the Framework refers to the government's objective to boost significantly the supply of housing and the provision of one additional unit would make a modest contribution to that objective. When judged against some of the core planning principles the proposal would perform well in that it would be in an urban area in a generally sustainable location where access to facilities is likely to be greatest. In terms of its component dimensions there would be a small social benefit in providing an extra housing unit. Economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house.
11. However, securing good living conditions for future occupiers and neighbouring residents is a key objective of sustainable development and would not be secured in this case; as a result, the social role of sustainable development

would not be achieved. When assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Therefore, the proposal would not be a sustainable form of development. The conflict with the development plan is not outweighed by other considerations including the Framework.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR