



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/25/3368287

8 Delta Court, Frome, Somerset BA11 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 Ms Diann Darling against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref. is 2025/0593/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a garage conversion to form an Annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed garage conversion on parking provision and highway safety.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that Delta Court is part of an estate development which the Officer's Report explains comprises 130 dwellings, and as the objection of the Frome Civic Society aptly observes, is *'a tight modern urban development which will have met minimum parking standards in its original design'*.
4. The grounds of appeal correctly refer to the fact that under the condition applied to the original consent, the garage can be used for ancillary domestic storage. As such, any harm caused could be the loss of a 'potential' as opposed to an 'existing' parking space, albeit as a purpose built garage I consider it reasonable to assume that parking was the primary intention of the building rather than domestic storage and that the latter was included in the condition to provide a common sense degree of flexibility in the use of the building.
5. In the event, one of the characteristics of the estate's design and layout is that the narrow road widths have only a limited capacity for on-street parking before there is a consequential adverse impact on the safety and convenience of vehicular access and indeed the character and appearance of the area.
6. The appeal scheme would increase the extent of accommodation on the site and even if conditioned to be ancillary to the dwelling there would be a potential increase in demand for parking because of a development that at the same time reduces its supply. In making this point I am also considering the possible needs of future occupiers, given that a permission would run with the property and not just the appellant.

7. On balance, I am of the view that in the circumstances of this tightly knit development, the loss of the parking space to additional residential accommodation would be in unacceptably harmful conflict with Policies DP9 & DP10 of the Mendip District Local Plan Part 1 2014 and the Somerset County Council Highways Standing Advice.
8. The appeal fails accordingly.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR