

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2024

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/24/3340646

36 Falstone, WOKING, Surrey, GU21 3HU

- 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 Salvatore Piazza against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2023/0865.
 - The development proposed is the installation of dropped kerb to facilitate access to forecourt parking to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the installation of dropped kerb to facilitate access to forecourt parking to the front of the property at 36 Falstone, WOKING, GU21 3HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2023/0865, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Site/Location Plans as Proposed (CDA-199-041 Rev A).

Preliminary Matters

2. It is clear from the evidence that a parking space set in loose stone chippings has been added to the front garden of 36 Falstone, albeit there was no dropped kerb at the time of my visit. The appellant considers that the stone chippings fall beyond the definition of development and the scope of my assessment. However, it is not for me to reach a finding on that issue within this appeal. Instead, I have assessed the appeal on the description of development and the plans before me, which show a dropped kerb and the front garden set in stone chippings and used for parking.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace property within a large corner plot, on the northern side of Falstone. Properties on the northern side of the road are terraced, with open frontages by design, now formed of a mixture of lawns, tarmac and chippings. Parking takes place at high density within the highway and within bays and garage courts. The bays and courts appear

to cut in towards front elevations, and parked vehicles are perpendicular to the road. On the opposite side of the carriageway, most properties have off street parking within front gardens, on significant areas of hardstanding.

5. The dropped kerb and use of the front garden for parking would not be uncharacteristic of the street scene. The perpendicular front garden parking space would appear akin to the nearby parking bays and courts, and the stone chippings reflect finish materials elsewhere within Falstone. Given No 36 has a larger corner plot, it can accommodate a vehicle and retain the hedge on the eastern edge. This results in the development respecting and making a positive contribution to the street scene.
6. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The development is therefore compliant with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), SPD Woking Design (2015) and NPPF insofar as they require schemes to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene.

Other Matters

7. The Council consider that granting permission, would make it difficult to resist future proposals for hardstanding/driveways on the landscaped frontages in respect of the northern side of the road. However, each scheme must be considered and determined on its individual merits. Many of the front gardens on the north side of the street appeared restrictively shallow in any event.

Conditions

8. Given that the site is already in use for a parking, a time condition is not needed in this case. The Council have suggested a condition relating to visibility zones. This does not seem necessary as a vehicle leaving the site can be positioned to gain adequate visibility, and road users turning into the road will be on the opposite side of the road, thereby providing separation.
9. A condition restricting the use of the parking area is also suggested. No compelling evidence has been put to me that an alternative use is likely or would be in anyway inappropriate, therefore, this condition is not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR