



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/W/21/3286462

The Old Post Office, 54 Main Street, Prickwillow CB7 4UN

- 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 Susan Dunk against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00377/FUL, dated 8 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development was described on the application form as change of use of an existing 1 bedroomed annexe with 1 bathroom and a kitchen/dining living area from a granny annexe (having been built to provide sheltered accommodation and care for elderly relative with alzheimers - since deceased) to a self contained holiday let.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The use has commenced and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development makes adequate provision for car parking and whether increased demand for on-street parking would inconvenience other road users.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at the eastern end of the village, set back from the B1382 Main Street near Prickwillow Bridge. Access is from a subsidiary road serving a cluster of houses, the Prickwillow Engine Museum, Green Farm, and a recreational grass bank with access to the River Lark. Use of the property has evolved over time, and the appeal site itself is the parcel of land encompassing 54 and 54A Main Street and the granny annexe. The proposal is the change of use of the granny annexe from ancillary use with No 54 to use as a self-contained holiday let.
5. Granny annexes are, by their nature, an ancillary part of a residential use. Use of the granny annexe as a self-contained holiday letting unit requires that consideration be given to parking for the appeal site as a whole. Overall numbers of occupiers residing in residential buildings can change over time, and it is not the actual numbers resident at any one time which determine the requirement for parking. Policy COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) requires developments to provide adequate levels of car parking, broadly in accordance with the Council's parking standards. Those standards

require two car parking spaces per dwelling, plus one for the letting bedroom resulting from the development. The use of the appeal site as a whole therefore requires five car parking spaces; an increase in one space as a result of the development.

6. The appeal site benefits from two off-street parking spaces, located in front of the annexe. Additional parking of three vehicles is therefore likely to be required at times on the street. The appellant's photographs and the Council's aerial photograph show cars parked in the turning heads opposite No 54A. That was also the case at the time of my visit, along with another car parked close to the front of No 54A. At my visit I had to reverse a significant distance in order to leave that stretch of the road, as would vehicles serving No's 50, 52 or 54A should the turning head be used for parking on a regular basis. The road is relatively narrow outside No 54 and 54A, and the only alternative parking location in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site was adjacent to the grass bank alongside the river. Parking is not restricted on the subsidiary road and, at the time of my visit there were already several cars parked there, such that I was unable to park anywhere south of Main Street. I noted that the Prickwillow Engine Museum had its own car park, but that it was private and gated. I also noted the farm beyond, and their representations relating to inconsiderate parking by river users in good weather. I visited the informal parking areas off the narrow roads north of main street, but noted their small capacity.
7. The subsidiary road serves only a small number of dwellings, a farm, a museum, but also the recreational area and access to the river. I note the support of the owner of Green Farm, and the potential for management of parking in the area. However, I also note the impact of inconsiderate parking on the farm and the absence of parking controls at the present time.
8. I note the appellant's reference to other visitor accommodation in the City of Ely without car parking, and the applicability of parking requirements to commercial holiday accommodation. Visitor accommodation in the City of Ely may benefit from a variety of transport options, and public car parks. However, in this rural location, I consider parking is required for visitor accommodation, where alternative transport options are more limited.
9. The appellant states there is a need for short-term accommodation in the area, although I have not seen evidence of a particular or pressing need for this type of accommodation in this location. I note the potential loss of income and employment should the use be required to cease. I also note the appellant's re-use of the existing annexe building as visitor accommodation, but that any new use should be considered against the requirements of the development plan. I have also considered the appellant's claim that there have been no complaints relating to parking, and that there would be less inconvenience than that associated with parking on the main road through Prickwillow; nevertheless, I have identified inconvenience witnessed at the time of my visit, and while my visit was only a snapshot in time, I have no reason to doubt it reflects typical parking conditions in the vicinity of the site. Together these matters carry only limited weight in favour of the development.
10. Overall, I consider there to be a high demand for parking in the area which leads to inconsiderate parking to the detriment of the convenience of road users. The development does not provide adequate levels of car parking and is

therefore contrary to Policy COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015, the relevant criteria of which are described above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Peter White

INSPECTOR