



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by **P H Wallace BSc (Hons) DipMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/25/3365571

Clearwen, 13 Wellingtonia Close, Willesborough, Kent TN24 0WW

- 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 Mark Lang against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2025/0255.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a roller door to car barn.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a roller door to car barn at Clearwen, 13 Wellingtonia Close, Willesborough, Kent TN24 0WW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/2025/0255, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading and paragraph 1 above are taken from the application form but have been shortened in the interests of precision.
3. The development has already been carried out as shown on the submitted plans and I have considered the proposal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

5. The appeal concerns a detached four-bedroom dwelling with a separate single bay car barn, fronted by on-site parking for two vehicles, and situated within a modern residential estate. Wellingtonia Close benefits from an attractive and informal layout, incorporating a shared surface for pedestrians and vehicles. With only a modest number of dwellings served beyond the appeal property, vehicular activity is light, and the gently meandering alignment of the route encourages low vehicle speeds. In this context, there are some limited opportunities for informal on-street parking near the site. Two on-street parking bays are also located immediately outside the appeal property and appear to be available for use by local residents, including the appellant. For part of my site visit, one of these bays was occupied. No other vehicle parking on-street was observed in the immediate vicinity, with parking confined to private off-road areas, including car barns and dedicated bays.

6. The Council is concerned the installation of the roller door has rendered the car barn functionally equivalent to a garage. Following on from Kent Highway Services Interim Guidance Note 3 on Residential Parking, the Council's Residential Parking and Design Guidance SPD 2010 indicates that garages should not be counted as allocated parking in this suburban location due to the propensity for them to be used as domestic stores. Consequently, the Council considers that on-site parking provision falls one space short of the three required by Policy TRA3(a) of the Ashford Local Plan 2030 (LP), potentially leading to parking on surrounding roads where capacity is limited, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.
7. I acknowledge that partial enclosure of the car barn through the addition of the roller door could reduce its usable parking capacity, although at the time of my site visit, it accommodated a parked vehicle alongside a mobility scooter and other incidental storage items. Accounting for the development generating some on-street parking demand, the specific characteristics of the location indicate that one extra vehicle could be absorbed by the two adjacent parking bays and by the lightly trafficked nature of the street, which affords some opportunity for limited informal on-street parking. Should informal parking occur, in this case the context suggests pedestrians and vehicles would have sufficient opportunity to safely navigate around parked cars, thereby avoiding harm to highway or pedestrian safety.
8. Notably, observations elsewhere in the estate indicate that several car barns have been fitted with front-facing roller-style doors or similar, with no evident informal on-street parking arising in those areas.
9. Accordingly, the proposal does not result in an increased risk to highway and pedestrian safety and therefore accords with Policy TRA3(a) of the LP which details parking standards for residential development.

Conditions

10. The Council has proposed conditions requiring the proposal to be implemented in accordance with the submitted drawings and relating to the external materials. However, as the development has already been constructed, it is not necessary to impose such conditions in this case.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR