



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/21/3272100

Site Address 1 Hayburn Road, Redhouse, Swindon SN25 2ET

- 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 Chris Jennings against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/HOU/20/1512/EMMI, dated 20 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the available parking provision and associated manoeuvring space for residents of the nearby dwellings.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Number 1 Hayburn Road is a three-bedroom detached property set within a residential area. The dwelling has been extended at the rear and benefits from a private garage and parking space, which are both located next to the courtyard behind the property. This courtyard area is shared with nearby residents. The proposal seeks to convert the garage into habitable space. The Planning Officer's Report states that the original permissions for this housing development removed permitted development rights for the conversion of garages due to the limited availability of additional parking.
5. Policy TR2 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026, adopted 2015 (SLP), requires that development adheres to the Council's adopted parking standards. The Council's Development Control Guidance Note, Technical Guidance on Parking Standards, adopted December 2007, requires single family dwellings with up to four bedrooms to provide two parking spaces per unit. The appeal site currently meets this provision with the garage and adjacent parking space. However, the conversion of the garage, and resulting loss of parking provision, would mean that the development would not comply with this Policy.

6. The estate on which the appeal site is located has been designed with garages as an integral element of the parking provision, though using the space to park vehicles cannot be mandated. The appellant has noted they currently use the space to store household paraphernalia and instead utilise the area in front of the garage door, which is not within their ownership, for parking. However, notwithstanding its current use, conversion of the garage would result in the permanent reduction in the available parking provision.
7. The plans show the retention of a false garage door, which would give the illusion of the building still being used as a garage. Although this may deter visitors from blocking access by using the space in front, the likelihood is that residents of nearby houses would become aware of the availability of the space. Additional informal parking would result in obstruction or reduction in manoeuvring space in the communal courtyard to the detriment of all users of this space. Further garage conversions could also exacerbate this situation.
8. The Council have concluded that the development would result in risk to other road users and the functionality of the public highway. However, as there would only be a reduction of one parking space and the effect would be primarily within the courtyard, in this case there would not be significant safety implications on the wider highway network. But this does not minimise the harm that would arise.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposal would result in the loss of a required parking space within the boundary of the appeal site, and this would have a detrimental impact on parking and manoeuvring space for residents of nearby dwellings. The proposal would not accord with Policy TR2 of the SLP and the associated parking standards, which require a minimum of two parking spaces for units of this size. There would also be conflict with Policy DE1 of the SLP, which seeks to ensure development take account of place-making principles including in respect of accessibility.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR