



The Planning Inspectorate

3D Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 44 45931
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: West1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Your Ref: 23/02689/FULLN
Our Ref: APP/C1760/D/23/3334711

Planning and Building Service
Test Valley Borough Council
Beech Hurst
Weyhill Road
Andover
Hampshire
SP10 3AJ

05 June 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr and Mrs Meadowcroft
Site Address: 231 Picket Twenty Way, Andover, Hampshire, SP11 6UG

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

If you have queries or feedback about the decision or the way we handled the appeal(s), you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate/about/complaints-procedure>.

If you do not have internet access please write to the Customer Quality Unit at the address above.

If you would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our feedback procedure, please contact our Customer Service Team on 0303 444 5000.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

The Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome in the attached decision. If you want to alter the outcome you should consider obtaining legal advice as only the High Court can quash this decision.

We are continually seeking ways to improve the quality of service we provide to our customers. As part of this commitment we are seeking feedback from those who use our service. It would be appreciated if you could take some time to complete this short survey, which should take no more than a few minutes complete:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/Planning_inspectorate_customer_survey

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Jasmine Rogers

Jasmine Rogers

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notice>

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is -

<https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate>



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