



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3306649

24 Clover Drive, Poole BH17 7US

- 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 Andrew Knowler against the decision of
 - Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole (BCP) Council.
 - The application Ref: APP/22/00946/F dated 9 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension including garage and car port. Single storey extension to rear elevation and demolition of existing garage in rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension including garage and car port; single storey extension to rear elevation and demolition of existing garage in rear garden at 24 Clover Drive, Poole BH17 7US in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: APP/22/00946/F dated 9 July 2022 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 24 Clover Dr 002 Rev A; 24 Clover Dr 004 Rev A; 24 Clover Dr 005 Rev A; 24 Clover Dr 006 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the garage/ store and covered car parking area in front have been constructed and these together with the land in front of the house shall be retained and kept available for the parking of vehicles at all times.

Main Issue

2. The reason for refusal is specific to the effect of the proposal on the on-site parking provision and consequent effect on parking stress in the surrounding area and harm to highway safety and efficiency. The Council raises no concerns with the proposed extensions to the property including a two storey side and single storey rear extension. From all the representations before me and my site visit, I have no reason to take a different view.

3. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the on-site parking provision and consequent effect on parking stress in the surrounding area and harm to highway safety and efficiency.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the north-west side of Clover Drive, a cul de sac in a predominantly residential area, comprising both houses and flats. The proposal seeks a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The side extension would include accommodation at first floor over a new garage/ store with a part covered car parking area in front. The existing garage to the rear of the site would be demolished.
5. I agree with the Council that the proposed garage would not be deep enough to accommodate most modern cars, but there would be space in front for one parking space. Although I have not been provided with measured drawings the Appellants have submitted photographs to show that it would still be possible to park 2 cars on site, by also using the area in front of the house.
6. The Council's Parking Standards SPD (2021) would require 2 on-site parking spaces for the size of the proposed house. I accept that the two spaces would not meet precisely the standards for the layout of parking spaces as set out in the SPD but from the information before me, and with the addition of the proposed extension, I consider that it would be possible to provide parking for two cars on site.
7. The Council's Highway Officer has set out that this local area is not sustainably located in terms of alternative modes of travel. However, there is no information before me to indicate that the local area suffers from parking stress and there is unrestricted on-street parking within Clover Drive, including outside of the appeal property. Furthermore, there is no information to demonstrate that the proposal would lead to harm to highway safety and efficiency, which would justify withholding permission in this case. The appeal property is located within a short cul de sac serving a modest number of houses and flats, and there is no evidence before me to suggest that the road is heavily trafficked.
8. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable in car parking terms. Whilst it would not meet precisely the requirements of the SPD in terms of the layout and size of the car parking spaces, it would not conflict with the overall objectives of Policy PP35 of the Poole Local Plan to achieve a safe, well - connected and accessible transport network. In the particular circumstances of this case the deviation from the SPD in terms of the parking spaces does not lead me to withhold planning permission.

Other Considerations

9. The site is covered by an Area Tree Preservation Order (Creekmoor No 1) made in 1966 but I agree with the Council that the proposed works would not affect the tree closest to the proposed works. There would be no adverse effect on trees.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. In terms of conditions, matching materials with the existing dwelling are required in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the

existing property and of the local area. I shall also add a condition to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

11. A condition should also be imposed as requested by the Council to retain the proposed parking provision on site but I consider that this condition should be widened to include not only the garage but also the proposed covered car parking space and the area in front of the appeal property to provide an appropriate level of on-site parking.
12. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR