



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/20/3259219

7 Crozier Lane, Warfield, Bracknell, RG42 4GT

- 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 Rohit Ail against the decision of Bracknell Forest Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00263/FUL, dated 4 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is Installation of door to existing car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Installation of door to existing car port at 7 Crozier Lane, Warfield, Bracknell, RG42 4GT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00263/FUL, dated 4 April 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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 plans: BK493344 - notes referred to official copy; BK96211 - HM Land Registry Plan; Block Plan; Existing and Proposed Elevations; Plot 113 - Development Layout.
 - 3) The garage accommodation shall be retained for the use of the parking of vehicles at all times.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development instead of the much longer and detailed description given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a carport at the side of a detached house within a housing estate. It is the last of three houses set off to the side of the estate road which are accessed by a paved area ending at a turning head in front of the appellant's house. Land beyond the turning head forms part of the housing estate landscaping scheme. The block plan shows it accessed by a footpath extending from the turning head, although at the time of my visit there was no

path in place. The carport is set back behind a driveway which has room for 2 additional carparking spaces. The proposal is for a door to be added to the carport.

5. Bracknell Forest Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (March 2016) requires 3 car parking spaces for 4 bedroomed properties. The Council is concerned that the addition of a door may result in the carport being used for storage, resulting in an under provision of parking spaces at the appellant's property and the potential use of the turning head for parking.
6. The carport includes an attached storeroom to its rear. At the time of my visit a car was parked in the carport and some items stored there too. The addition of a garage door would not reduce the space available, nor would it impact on the storage space attached to the rear. I see no reason why it would prevent the continued use of the building for parking even though it would not meet the Council's size specifications for a garage.
7. Furthermore, the turning head only appears to serve the appellant's house. Neighbouring properties have enough space to turn in and out of the parking spaces to the front of their houses and because they are set off to the side of the estate road there is no through traffic. As such, even if the appellant or visitors occasionally parked in the turning area, it would not impede parking at neighbouring properties, nor would it effect traffic flows or highway safety. The footpath referred to has not been constructed, although there is a gap to the side of the appellant's fence allowing pedestrian access to it, which would not be significantly affected by vehicles occasionally parking on the turning area.
8. Overall, I am satisfied that in this particular case the proposed development would not result in a negative impact on highway safety and there would be no conflict with Policy M9 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan 2002, Policy CS23 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (February 2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to ensure adequate parking provision, safe travel and to prevent an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. As suggested by the Council, I have also included a condition ensuring the garage should be retained for vehicle parking which is necessary to ensure sufficient off-road parking is provided in the interests of highways safety.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR