

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/16/3163884
14 Maple Road, Surbiton KT6 4AB

- 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 Natalie Turner against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/16478/HOU, dated 28 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a dropped kerb outside the property. This is to the left side of the property as you look at it to avoid having to move a parking meter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on other residents by reason of the implications for on-street parking spaces.

Reasons

3. At the time of the site visit it was observed that very few on-street parking spaces were available within the surrounding area, particularly along Maple Road and St Andrews Square. There are restrictions which operate to limit the parking spaces to residents' vehicles during the daytime between Monday and Saturday. However, visitors can park their vehicles within some of the spaces during the restricted period subject to the payment of a charge. The parking spaces fronting the property along the east side of Maple Road are residents only. There was a steady flow of traffic along the road during the site visit and some queuing associated with the traffic lights.
4. The construction of the proposed dropped kerb outside the appeal property would lead to the potential loss of 2 on-street parking spaces. The ability to park within the property's front garden could, as claimed by the appellant, off-set the loss of the on-street parking spaces. However, no specific details have been provided about how the vehicles might park within the front

garden. What was observed at No. 16 was that there was 1 potential space to park a reasonably sized family car. The area directly in-front of this neighbouring dwelling might be able to accommodate a small car as indicated in the photographs. Therefore, the loss of 2 on-street parking space could be off-set.

5. However, although they could be used by the appellant, there is no allocation of the on-street parking spaces. The spaces which would be removed because of the proposed development are currently available to all residents. Any parking spaces provided within the curtilage of the property would be unavailable to these other residents. The potential loss of on-street spaces in-front of the property would also result in a significant length of road without parking provision because of the dropped kerbs which would be associated with the property and Nos. 16 and 18. By reason of the very limited availability of parking spaces along the adjacent roads, the potential loss of 2 on-street spaces would exacerbate the observed parking stress within the area and thereby inconvenience the occupiers of other residential properties.
6. As noted by the appellant, parking stress can occur where there is a suspension of bays or a greater demand for spaces associated with the increase in the occupancy of existing dwelling houses. However, the suspension of bays is for a temporary period and parking provision is normally a material consideration for schemes where planning permission is required. These matters do not substantially and demonstrably outweigh the harm which has been identified. By reason of the lack of evidence to demonstrate planning permission exists for a dropped-kerb, the potential use of the front garden of No. 12 for parking purposes has not been taken into account.
7. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to other residents by exacerbating the demand for on-street parking spaces and, as such, it would conflict with Policy CS7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy concerning managing on and off-street parking provision to promote sustainability and residential amenity.

Other Matters

8. The property is located within the St Andrews Square Conservation Area where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. The Council has not suggested that the proposed development would conflict with this statutory duty or cause specific harm to significance of this heritage asset. However, this matter does not alter the main issue which has been identified as the basis for the determination of this appeal. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should fail.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR