

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/16/3156301

Flat B, 357B Pinner Road, Harrow, Middlesex HA1 4HN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Clodagh Larkin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1407/16, dated 17 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a vehicle crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development instead of the longer and detailed description given on the application form. I shall consider the appeal accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - (i) the provision of on-street parking; and
 - (ii) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Provision of on-street parking

4. Due to the lack of access by the appellant to the hard standing used for car parking at the front of the appeal site, the proposal seeks planning permission for the creation of a vehicular access to the rear garden via Collapit Close. This would be served by the formation of a dropped kerb and crossover within the highway.
 5. Collapit Close is a cul de sac and is characterised by a relatively high density of modern flats and is sited within a Controlled Parking Zone. Double yellow lines also prevents further parking on sections of the highway. Due to the restrictions in place, parking at the rear of the appeal site is available for the
-

appellant between the hours of 10.00-11.00 and 14.00-15.00 Monday to Friday.

6. I note the concerns of the Highway Authority with regard to the proposal resulting in the loss of one on-street space. At the time of my early-afternoon site visit, a number of the available parking spaces were in use by permit holders. It is reasonable to assume that the level of use of the available spaces would significantly increase during the evening and at weekends when residents of the flats are returning from work or are at home.
7. There is no dispute that the proposal would reduce the availability of one on street parking space. It is clear to me that given the number of dwellings within Collapit Close, demand for parking is high. Consequently, the loss of a single car parking space would result in a significant increase in on-street parking pressure. Given the lack of opportunities for on-street parking I consider that problems in respect of highway safety, including inconsiderate parking, may result.
8. I acknowledge the inconvenience to the appellant by not being able to park at either the front or rear of her dwelling. In addition, reference was made to the existence of vehicle crossovers in proximity to the appeal site. I have little information relating to these developments and whether the circumstances which lead to the relevant approvals being granted are comparable. As such, a comparison is of limited relevance in this instance and I have considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits.
9. I therefore consider that the proposal runs contrary to Policies DM 1 and DM 42 of Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013 (the DMP). When taken together these policies, amongst other things, state that new development must have regard to the convenience of parking. The Council has also referred to Policy 6.10 B of The London Plan 2015. However, this policy makes no reference to specific car parking considerations and I therefore do not consider it is relevant to the issue in this case.

Character and appearance

10. The majority of dwellings in proximity to the appeal site on Pinner Road have hard standing and vehicle crossovers to enable parking for one or more vehicles at the front of their dwellings. Accordingly, the terrace in which the appeal site is located is characterised by open frontages with boundary treatments at the side of each dwelling. The rear of the group of terraces consists of mainly substantial close boarded fencing, with a number of mature trees located along the rear boundaries of the gardens.
11. However within the terrace I acknowledge that 351 Pinner Road currently has a vehicle crossover and it has been necessary for the occupier of this dwelling to replace the wooden fencing with access gates. Although the wooden gates have replaced the fence line, I do not consider that this has resulted in significant harm to the character of the area.
12. In the evidence submitted by the appellant, she has confirmed that it will be necessary to replace the existing fence in order to allow access. I am of the opinion that the introduction of replacement fencing and a set of gates would have limited harm on the character of the area. Furthermore, it would also be necessary for a section of the current rear garden area to be replaced with

permeable paving. Views of this from within the public realm would be extremely limited and I do not consider that such views would result in any harm with regard to the character of the area.

13. Consequently, I find no harm in terms of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore does not compromise the design objectives of Policies DM 1 and DM 42 or design guidance contained within the Harrow Council Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Design Guide 2010.

Other Matters

14. The concern raised regarding the handling of the application by the Council has been acknowledged. However, this is a procedural issue which does not concern the planning merits of the case. Accordingly, I have not attached any weight to this matter.

Conclusion

15. I accept that the proposal would provide secure off street car parking for the appellant and no substantial harm would result in terms of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. However, the significant harm I have found with regards to the increase to on-street car parking pressure is decisive.
16. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Cassini

INSPECTOR