



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/21/3279498

59 Woodcrest Walk, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0JW

- 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 Ms Kate Pain against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00622/F, dated 26 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of attached dwelling with 3 bedrooms and off street car parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised Framework¹ was published by the Government between the determination of the planning application and the appeal coming before me. It does not raise any new considerations in relation to this appeal and as such I have not sought comment from the main parties. I have had regard to the revised Framework in my decision.
3. The reason for refusal refers to the parking standards contained within Annex 3 of the Local Plan². However, the parking standards are contained within Annex 4. The appellant has nevertheless identified the appropriate parking requirements for the proposal, and I am satisfied that the Council's mistake has not prejudiced the appellant.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of local residents from increased pressure for on-street parking.

Reasons

5. Woodcrest Walk lies within a residential area to the north-west of Redhill town centre. There are some local facilities which are walkable to the site but generally it seems unlikely that existing or future residents of the area could undertake their day-to-day tasks without access to a car.
6. The majority of the houses on Woodcrest Walk do not have on site parking. Car parking appears to be available via layby type parking areas, communal garage

¹ National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

² Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (2019)

areas and on-street parking. The current dwelling at 59 Woodcrest Walk does have an area of hardstanding which provides some off-street parking. There is also on-street parking to the front of the dwelling.

7. An existing side extension to the property would be removed as part of the proposal and be replaced by the new dwelling. As part of these works, the area immediately in front of the new dwelling would be reconfigured to provide two off-street parking spaces for it. This would meet the requirements of the local parking standards outlined in Annex 4 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that a 3 bedroom dwelling in this location provides a minimum of 2 car parking spaces.
8. The garden area to the front of 59 Woodcrest Walk itself would be raised and a parking area provided for this existing dwelling. However, one on-street space would be lost in creating the new crossover to serve 59 Woodcrest Walk. Furthermore, although the amended drawings suggest the new parking area could potentially accommodate two cars, the size of space, its position and the manoeuvres required to park two cars on it suggest that it would in reality be used to park a single car. The appellant's submission acknowledges this and refers to the possibility of one car being displaced on-street. As such, this dwelling would very probably have an under provision of one space when compared to the requirements of the local parking standards. Overall, the proposal would be likely to result in a deficit of two spaces.
9. Policy DES1 of the Local Plan is a wide-ranging policy which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that new developments make adequate provision for parking. Policy TAP1 of the Local Plan specifically relates to access, parking and servicing and seeks, amongst other things, to ensure developments include car parking in accordance with the adopted local parking standards. However, it does allow for reduced parking provision, provided there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate this would not be harmful.
10. A Parking Survey undertaken by Motion in June 2021, encompassed Woodcrest Walk, Windmill Drive and Windmill Way, as they are within 200m of the appeal site, which generally equates to a 2-minute walk. The Highways Technical Note prepared by Motion, and within which the results of the Parking Survey are presented, concludes that there is an existing parking demand of 78% for on-street spaces, which could increase to 80% to take account of the demand created by the proposal. A level of 85% is generally regarded as being critical.
11. However, the figures in the Parking Survey suggest that the level of parking stress is not even across the surveyed area. On Woodcrest Walk, parking is already at critical levels. The parking stress on Windmill Drive is just below the critical level but would be likely to exceed it if just one additional car were using it for parking. Thus, the existing capacity is generally on Windmill Way, where properties have their own driveways and off-street parking provision.
12. Despite some properties near the appeal site having driveways, the parking survey has shown that the existing levels of on-street parking along Woodcrest Walk are already high. My own observations, which I acknowledge were only a snapshot of one midweek morning, were consistent with the situation the survey describes. Thus, it seems likely that some residents near the appeal site at certain times of the day are having to park away from their houses, either further down Woodcrest Walk, or in nearby roads such as Windmill Drive and Windmill Way. Overall, it seems to me that residents who live in the immediate

vicinity of the appeal site are already suffering from high levels of parking demand.

13. Whilst there may be some capacity on other nearby roads, Windmill Way is accessed off Windmill Drive and is not a straight or flat route from the appeal site. For people living in Woodcrest Walk, parking two streets from their house, even though it is within 200m of the appeal site may not be an attractive proposition. If, for example, they were dealing with children, carrying shopping or had mobility issues, this would be a particularly unattractive option. Accordingly, it seems to me that the proposal is likely to exacerbate the existing pressure and competition for on-street parking space. This would be to the detriment of the living conditions of existing residents generally but those in Woodcrest Walk and near the appeal site in particular.
14. On this main issue, I find that the increased pressure for on-street parking caused by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of local residents. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DES1, TAP1 and Annex 4 of the Local Plan which, amongst other things, seek an appropriate level of on-site parking provision to ensure developments do not create unacceptable harm.

Other Matters

15. I note that the proposal is said to accord with the Council's housing policies and strategy and does not raise objections from the Council in relation to the building's design and character. Furthermore, it is indicated that the impact on neighbouring amenity and the quality of accommodation are agreed with the Council. However, these factors would represent a lack of harm which would be neutral in any balance.
16. I note that there was no response from the Highway Authority but that it has granted a crossover licence for the existing dwelling. I also note the appellants suggestion that an additional crossover would reduce on-street parking outside the appeal site and thus improve turning for larger vehicles within the cul-de-sac. However, the weight I could attach to these factors is limited and would in any event be insufficient against the harm and conflict with the development plan that I have found and to which I ascribe substantial weight.

Conclusion

17. The proposal would harm the living conditions of local residents and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR