



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/22/3297480

6 Meath Green Farm Close, Horley, Surrey, RH6 8NB.

- 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 and Mrs Collins against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03264/HHOLD, dated 22 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of infill to existing single storey car port to include new external window. Installation of double doors to rear to provide storage access. Internal modifications to allow access to new bedroom through main property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on on-street parking provision and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 6 Meath Green Farm Close, is the end of terrace, two-storey dwelling, linked to the adjoining short terrace of houses with single storey covered car ports and covered access way to a car park behind.
4. The Appeal property is part of a large and relatively new housing estate. The site sits adjacent to the Meath Green Conservation Area and a locally listed farm building.
5. The appellants propose altering the car port adjacent to their house to form an additional bedroom and small outside store. The host dwelling currently enjoys off-street parking for two vehicles. If the development were to go ahead this would be reduced to just one space.
6. Policy DES1 of the of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan (Adopted September 2019) (DMP), at criterion 10 requires, amongst other things, new development to make adequate provision for parking taking account of the impact on local character and residential amenity, including the impact of parked vehicles.
7. Further DMP Policy TAP1 requires car parking for residential development to be provide in accordance with adopted standards unless satisfactory evidence is

- provided to demonstrate that non-compliance would not result in unacceptable harm. Such evidence could include on-street parking surveys, evidence of parking demand, and/or further information on accessibility. Development should not result in unacceptable levels of on-street parking demand in existing or new streets.
8. The Development is within a Low Accessibility site as defined in Annex 3 of the DMP. Annex 4 of the DMP *Parking Standards* advises that a dwelling of this size should have a minimum of two spaces. Accordingly, if the development were to go ahead it would not accord with the provisions of Annex 4.
 9. The appellants have not submitted any substantive evidence, as required by DMP Policy TAP1 to demonstrate that non-compliance would not result in unacceptable harm. They simply propose that any shortfall in carparking needed to serve the dwelling could be provided by utilising on-street parking provision within the development for residents and visitors. They suggest the use of a small parking area virtually opposite the appeal site and on-street parking in the access road.
 10. I visited the site in the middle of the day when, I expect many residents would be away from home. Nevertheless, at the time of my visit the small parking area was occupied by large Luton style box vans. In addition, as identified by the Council, no doubt in the evenings or weekends, when residents are home, there is already some on-street parking. I believed, based on my experience, that the loss of this off-street parking space here would serve to increase on-street parking in the area. Which in turn would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 11. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would, by reason of the loss of an off-road parking space and resultant insufficient car parking provision within an area defined as low accessibility, lead to unacceptable pressure for on-street parking and would increase the level of street clutter along Meath Green Farm Close and the wider development site, resulting in harm to the visual amenities of the area.
 12. To allow the appeal, based on the limited evidence provided by the appellants as required by DMP Policy TAP1 would therefore be contrary to aims of DMP Policies TAP1 and DES1, and the parking standards contained within Annex 3 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and guidance contained within the RBBC Local Character and Distinctiveness Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted June 2021).

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR