
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3291423

10 Fobbing Road, Corringham, SS17 9BG

- 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 Mrs Lianne Starkey against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01314/HHA, dated 25 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two-storey side and rear extension, a part single-storey rear extension and an open sided mono pitch porch structure over new front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two-storey side and rear extension, a part single-storey rear extension and an open sided mono pitch porch structure over new front door at 10 Fobbing Road, Corringham, SS17 9BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01314/HHA, dated 25 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: K1176-PL-002 - Rev A, K1176-PL-101- Rev A, K1176-PL-102- Rev B, K1176-PL-103- Rev E, K1176-PL-104- Rev A, K1176-PL-105 - Rev A, K1176-PL-106- Rev A, K1176-PL-107- Rev A, K1176-PL-108- Rev A, K1176-PL-109- Rev A, K1176-PL-110- Rev A, and K1176-PL-112- Rev C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was amended through the submission of revised plans including Drg No K1176-PL-112 Rev C, to which I have had regard. The appellant has

pointed out that this plan has been incorrectly referenced on the decision notice as Drg No *K1176-PL-111-C*. I am satisfied that this is an error as the relevant plan has been provided to me by the Council and I am able to see the drawing reference number for myself.

Main Issue

3. The Council raised no issues with the proposal regarding its design and appearance, or its neighbour impact. I have no reason to disagree. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposal upon highway safety having regard to the level of parking provision that is proposed.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-bed, semi-detached dwelling with a fairly narrow side driveway that leads to a small garage to the rear. The proposal would add extensions to the side and rear, creating a larger three-bed dwelling and with a single parking bay to the front.
5. There seems to be no dispute between the parties that the Council's parking requirement for a three-bed dwelling would be at least two off-street spaces according to their draft parking standards, as has been referred to within the officer's report and consultation response from its Highways Development Control team. In addition, despite some apparent reservations expressed about the size of the proposed parking bay, the Council accept that the proposal would provide one feasible parking space, as stated within an email from the planning officer to the appellant's agent on 29 September 2021. I am satisfied that this is the case. Whilst the dimensions of the bay given on the proposed parking layout plan are 2.4m x 5.0m, and below the minimum size of 2.5m x 5.0m required as identified by the Highways Officer, it is clear that the constrained part of the space would only be where the bonnet of a parked car would be positioned with additional width available for the majority of its length. This would enable it to function as a usable parking space. The proposal would therefore fall short of the Council's off-street parking requirement by one space.
6. I accept that the failure to provide off-street parking in accordance with the Council's requirements could lead to additional on-street parking. However, there are no road markings or parking restrictions along this part of Fobbing Road that would prevent this from taking place. At the time of my visit there was some on-street parking in the vicinity of the appeal site. Whilst this effectively narrowed Fobbing Road to a single-carriageway width in places, this is not an unusual situation and I saw plenty of opportunities for cars to comfortably pass each other where parking on either side of the road was naturally restricted by the number of pavement crossovers leading to existing parking to the front forecourt of many properties. I saw nothing to suggest that the current situation was in any way problematic and neither have the Council provided any substantive evidence to support their assertion that on-street parking is detrimental to pedestrian or highway safety in terms of obstruction, visibility, or dangerous vehicle manoeuvres, regardless of the status of Fobbing Road within the road network hierarchy.
7. In addition, the appellant has provided a parking survey undertaken during night-time hours on two consecutive weekdays. This clearly shows the number

of possible on-street parking spaces within a 200m distance of the appeal site and that levels of parking stress at the time of the surveys were not extreme. I have no doubt that this situation might fluctuate at different times to a degree, but I have no reason to think that demand exceeds supply in general, or that the surroundings do not have the capacity to reasonably accommodate the demand from one displaced vehicle at No 10 as a result of the proposal.

8. The Council's *Residential Alterations and Extensions Design Guide SPD 2017* states that any extra parking requirements and the impact of a proposal on on-street parking will be considered according to the Council's current policy. For the reasons given above, despite the shortfall in off-road parking of one space, I am satisfied that there would be no adverse effect on highway safety from the impact of any additional demand for on-street parking. As such, there would be no conflict with Policies PMD2, PMD8 or PMD9 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended) 2015 insofar as that, between them, they seek to avoid any prejudice from development to road safety through inappropriate on-street parking.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the materials used externally match those on the existing building.

Conclusion

10. In the absence of any identified conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR