



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/22/3308645

3 Anzio Gardens, Caterham, Surrey CR3 5GE

- 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 Mark Hardisty against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2022/298, dated 25 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing double garage into a home office/gym and wet area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of existing double garage into a home office/gym and wet area at 3 Anzio Gardens, Caterham, Surrey CR3 5GE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2022/298, dated 25 February 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: PL210.01; PL210.02; PL210.03 and PL210.04.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 3 Anzio Gardens, Caterham, Surrey CR3 5GE.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are i) whether there is appropriate provision for parking in the area for the proposed development and ii) impact on the living conditions of surrounding residents.

Reasons

Parking provision

3. The appeal site is located in a residential estate consisting of dwellinghouses and flatted developments. The appeal site is a townhouse located on the north-western corner of an enclosed square adjoining a row of garages. There are no parking restrictions in Anzio Gardens. The appeal consists of the conversion of the existing double garage adjoining the appellants property into habitable rooms which are accessed via the appellants' garden.

4. The approach of the Tandridge Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted September 2012 is that residential development is required to meet maximum car parking standards. The appeal site is required to provide two allocated spaces. Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies, adopted July 2014 (TLP) is specifically requires existing off-street parking spaces (including garages) to be maintained where they are considered necessary to serve the existing buildings, providing it does not result in additional on-street parking which would cause congestion or harm to highway safety. The Council therefore are concerned that the loss of two off-street allocated parking spaces would result in an overspill of on-street parking on the surrounding roads.
5. The appellant has undertaken parking stress surveys, consisting of two weekend surveys undertaken in September and October 2022. Whilst the surveys do not reflect the standard Lambeth methodology, the results nevertheless suggest that the surrounding residential roads identified are not heavily parked. On average, the availability of on-street parking spaces ranged between 7 and 12 spaces at any one time. The surveys therefore highlight that there is available capacity on-street for the overspill of two cars resulting from the proposal. These surveys have not been disputed by the Council. As such, based on the evidence before me I accept there are adequate levels of on-street parking in the immediate area to accommodate the loss of two off-street parking spaces.
6. It has been demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a harmful effect on highway safety, caused by an increased demand for parking on nearby roads. It would, therefore, accord with Policy CSP12 of the Tandridge Core Strategy, adopted October 2008 (TCS) and Policies DP5 and DP7 of the TLP which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that proposals do not unnecessarily impede the free flow of traffic, nor result in additional on-street parking which would cause congestion or impact on highways safety.

Living conditions

7. The Council raise concerns in respect to the living conditions of surrounding residents with regard to the displacement of cars arising from the proposal impacting on their amenity. TLP Policy DP7 and TCS Policy CSP18, among other things seek to prevent harm to neighbouring amenity from traffic.
8. I have found that there are adequate levels of on-street parking nearby to accommodate any displaced off-street parking, as such the proposal is unlikely to result in any significant harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. Given there is limited evidence from the Council to indicate their specific concerns in respect to amenity, I would therefore conclude that there would be no harm to the living conditions of the surrounding residents as a result of the proposal. As such, the scheme would be compliant with TLP Policy DP7 and TCS Policy CSP18 which amongst other things, seek to safeguard residential amenity.

Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions requiring commencement of the development within three years and for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. I have also attached a condition which is necessary to ensure the use of the development remains ancillary to the main house.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Robert Naylor

INSPECTOR