



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2024

by **David Murray** BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/24/3347227

40 Redwood Drive, EPSOM, KT19 8FL

- 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 G Manthry against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00110/FLH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of garage space into habitable use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the conversion of the garage space into habitable use. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of a single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for this part of the development proposed at 40 Redwood Drive, EPSOM, KT19 8FL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00110/FLH, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no's 2106_PO4D and 2106_PO5D.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed works would make adequate provision for off-road parking and the effect on highway safety and the movement of traffic and pedestrians.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a detached house which faces Redwood Drive with an integral garage to the side and a parking space to the front of this. There are similar houses along the neighbouring frontage. On the opposite side of this road is an open landscaped area of grass. It is proposed to erect a single storey extension to the rear to enlarge the kitchen/dining area and convert the existing garage into a bedroom and en-suite to accommodate the appellant's wife who now needs ground floor accommodation.

4. The Council's objection relates only to the conversion of the garage to residential accommodation.

Effect on parking provision

5. At the site visit I noted that there were a number of cars parked half on the pavement outside of the properties along the frontage and these were likely to disrupt the passage of pedestrians, for example people pushing children in double buggies. Such parking would also restrict the visibility of drivers entering or leaving the driveways of other houses and entering Redwood Drive. Moreover, the visit was undertaken in the late morning when parking needs are likely to be light compared to the evening when occupiers return home. There is therefore local parking stress and on-street and partly on-pavement parking is not in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal to convert the garage space into a bedroom would be likely to add to this level of parking stress.
6. I have taken account of the appellant's view that the integral garages in this development are too small to accommodate some modern cars. However, it appears to me that the garage is of a standard size and could accommodate a modest family / small car. It is therefore not wholly unusable for its original purpose. I also note that Redwood Drive is a relatively short cul-de-sac without through traffic but this does not overcome the problems associated with the restrictions on visibility or the reduction in the useable width of the pavement.
7. The appellant also mentions other properties where the garage appears to have been converted into accommodation. However, it is not clear if such changes have been expressly permitted or if there is less parking stress nearby these properties. Therefore I cannot place much weight on this factor.
8. Overall on this issue I conclude that the proposed conversion of the integral garage to bedroom accommodation would not be in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety because it would add to further on-street parking stress and this would conflict with the provisions of Policy 37 and part (x) of Policy DM10 of the Council's Development Management Policies Document.

Planning balance

9. On the main issue I have found that the conversion of the garage to a bedroom would result in the loss of a parking space on site and an increase in on-street/pavement parking which would be harmful to highway and pedestrian safety, and conflict with the relevant provision of the development plan.
10. This harmful effect and policy conflict is not outweighed by other factors including the particular needs of the appellant and family from the limited information presented. Therefore this part of the appeal should not be allowed. However, there is no planning objection to the other part of the proposal concerning the extension at the rear of the property and the appeal on this element can succeed.
11. The Council recommends standards conditions be imposed concerning the implementation of the permission; accord with the (partially) approved plans; and that the external materials in the extension shall match the existing dwelling. These are conditions necessary to regulate the development in the interests of clarity and the appearance of the area and I shall impose them.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

David Murray

INSPECTOR