



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2024

by H Faulkner BSc (Hons) MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/23/3334711

231 Picket Twenty Way, Andover, Hampshire SP11 6UG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Meadowcroft against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02689/FULLN, decision issued 6 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is to 'convert garage into habitable room. Front facade remaining the same. Additional parking space (persimmon land to be used)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the development would provide an acceptable parking arrangement.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is currently a two-bedroom flat which is situated above a garage block containing four garages. One of the garages is within the ownership of the appellant and it is this that is intended to be converted to living accommodation.
4. The building is part of a modern housing estate where there are various parking arrangements including on plot parking, roadside parking, and parking courts such as where the appeal property is located.
5. The as-built arrangement for this particular area is that there are 4 garages each with a parking space in front. This allows for at least two parking spaces being provided for each of the surrounding houses as approved under the original consent for the estate.
6. There is a condition attached to the original consent that garages should always be available for the parking of motor vehicles.
7. Other than the allocated marked out bays there are limited other parking options available in the parking courtyard or in the immediate vicinity.
8. In converting the garage the appellant would lose one of their parking spaces. In order to maintain two parking spaces the appellant proposes using an area in front of the property, part of which is a pathway to the front door.

9. In the evidence provided by the appellant they acknowledge that the space is technically too short to meet the required standard of 4.8m. However, even if the standard were met parking a vehicle in this area would likely impede occupiers and visitors from conveniently and safely accessing the entrance door. Even if cars are parked as far from the building as possible, so that the front door was not completely blocked, access would still be difficult. When the adjacent spaces to the side are occupied there would be minimal space between the cars for people to gain access to the property. This would create issues for those requiring access to the property's front door such as delivery services and people with pushchairs. Furthermore, because an additional vehicle parked in this area would significantly restrict the space in front of the appeal property, it would create an unacceptably challenging passage for people with mobility issues and in particular wheelchair users.
10. The housing development was designed with a clear access route to the front door. The use of this area for parking is unacceptable as it represents poor planning and design.
11. The reason for refusal makes reference to users 'likely parking in locations not intended for that purpose'. Other than the space proposed no evidence has been provided to demonstrate where any other such parking harm might occur. However, this does not override the concerns raised above.
12. In conclusion, the proposal would not provide an acceptable parking arrangement. It would therefore be contrary to Policy T2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD Adopted 2011-2029 where it requires that parking provisions should be well designed. The supporting text to this policy explains that 'parking spaces must be located and designed to ensure that they are safe, secure and practical'.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

H Faulkner

INSPECTOR