

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/16/3158635
1022A Harrow Road, London NW10 5NN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Hirani against the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 16/2114, is dated 18 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a third floor to provide one self-contained flat with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council resolved that had it been in a position to determine the application, it would have refused planning permission for reasons relating to the increase in demand for on-street parking and the impact of the proposed development on the free flow and safety of traffic and pedestrians in the area.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety in the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. This part of Harrow Road and the streets nearby are within a controlled parking zone where on-street parking is limited to residents and businesses with parking permits for the majority of the day.
 5. Policy TRN23 of the Brent Unitary Development Plan (2004) (UDP) states that exceptionally 'car-free' housing developments may be permitted in areas with good and very good public transport accessibility where occupation is restricted by condition to those who have signed binding agreements not to be car owners (other than for pooled communal vehicles). Such persons will not be granted residents parking permits.
 6. The proposed flat would increase the demand for on-street parking in the area by one space. The proposal does not include the provision of any off-street parking to meet this demand and there are no details of any mechanism before me, which would prevent the occupants of the proposed development from owning a car and seeking to park it on-street nearby. On my site visit at around mid-day on a weekday I observed a high demand for parking in the
-

area with very few spaces available on nearby streets, at a time outside of the peak demand period.

7. Therefore, I find that insufficient on-street parking is available in the area to absorb the demand generated by the proposed development. Thus without an appropriate means of ensuring the proposed development is car free, I find there would be a risk to highway safety as a result of residents finding it difficult to find a parking space, consequent extended journey times and potentially parking inappropriately.
8. For these reasons the proposal would be in conflict with the development plan. It would specifically be contrary to the aims of saved Policies and TRN3, TRN23 and TRN24 of the UDP which seek to ensure that the transport impacts of new development do not harm the living environment and a safe and efficient transport network.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the correspondence between the appellant and the Council. I have noted the lengthy delays and that overall the appellant is dissatisfied with the Council's handling of the planning application. However, these are matters which would need to be pursued with the Council. I confirm that I have had regard only to the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and with regard to all other matters raised, planning permission is refused and the appeal is dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR