



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/21/3283418

1 Poppy Fields Close, Pontefract WF8 4FW

- 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 John Wesbroom against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00173/FUL, dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to side, garage conversion to rear and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development set out above is taken from the appeal form and the decision notice as it better reflects the scheme that is before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the parking provision on the appeal site and whether as a result there would be an increased demand for on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety and the character of the area.

Reasons

4. The detached dwelling lies within a cul-de-sac containing residential properties of a similar style and design. The property is a family-sized home comprising of four bedrooms with front and rear gardens.
5. The main parties disagree on the number of parking spaces that the appeal property currently has based on the minimum size standards found in The Residential Design Guide Part 2; Guidance for Householders Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However, the SPD was adopted in January 2018 after the dwelling was granted planning permission.
6. Nevertheless, based on the Council's measurement, which the appellant does provide an alternative for, the existing garage is just about large enough for a vehicle. The width of the existing driveway is also at least the width of the existing garage. Hence, it seems to be capable of providing off-street parking for two vehicles.
7. The proposed garage would not accord with the minimum internal dimensions detailed in the SPD or have a door wide enough to allow a vehicle to enter or

- leave. It would not count as a vehicular parking space. In tandem with converting the existing garage into habitable accommodation, the proposal would, as a result, only leave one off-street parking space at the property.
8. Potentially, a further space could be formed in front of the dwelling using part of the front garden, but in doing so it would harmfully erode the modest front garden that softens and characterises the urban development in the close.
 9. Inevitably, the proposal will lead to vehicles parking on Poppy Field Close immediately outside the property, especially given the potential number of vehicles that a family home could have. It may be possible to park a vehicle next to the front garden without affecting access to the property's driveway or the access serving dwellings to the north. But any further vehicles, whether those are the occupants or visitors to the property, would be likely to affect the ability for vehicles, including refuse or emergency service vehicles, to either safely access neighbouring properties or utilise the turning facility. Moreover, vehicles parked in the close would likely affect drivers' visibility of pedestrians.
 10. There are no parking restrictions on Poppy Fields Avenue, but due to the distance from the appeal property, lack of natural surveillance and the regular pattern of dropped kerbs serving residents' driveways, vehicles linked to the appeal property are unlikely to park here. However, if it were to be relied upon, and the situation repeated many times over, then it would likely affect the safe and free flow of traffic and highway safety.
 11. There is no substantive evidence before me to support the appellant's view that the site is in a good location for facilities and services. So, whilst space would be provided for cycles and storage within the rear garden of the property, this would not offset the proposed amount of parking or that which could be relied upon on the road for a family home.
 12. I conclude that the proposed development would not provide a satisfactory amount of parking provision on the appeal site and as a result there would be an increased demand for on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety and the character of the area. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Development Policies D9, D10 and D14 and the SPD; which jointly seek an appropriate level of parking provision for the proposal and its location, in safe and accessible locations; and respect the character of the area.

Conclusion

13. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR