
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by Clive Sproule BSc MSc MSc MRTPI MEnvSci CEnv

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

Decision date: 26.05.2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/17/3166829

2A College Road, Isleworth TW7 5DH

- 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 Mr Sehajpal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00294/2A/P3, dated 18 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is 2 x two bed houses following demolition of existing bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter and Main Issue

2. The Council's appeal statement highlights that amended plans have been submitted with the appeal that reposition the proposed semi-detached block, which would place the northern elevation further away from the property boundary with no.2. The amended plans are dated in the week before the Council's decision on the application.
3. This appeal concerns the Council's determination of planning application Ref 00294/2A/P3. It is not apparent that all those who may wish to comment on the amended scheme will have been aware of the modified plans to enable them make representations on the new information. Therefore, my decision shall address the proposal on which consultations and publicity had been carried out and that was the subject of the Council's decision on 15 November 2016.
4. Within the context of the Council's reason for refusal and the evidence in this case, the main issue is considered to be the effect of the development proposed on highway safety.

Reasons

5. College Road is a suburban residential street that runs northwards from the shops, bus and rail links on London Road. The suburban layout on College Road causes houses to have amenity space between the dwelling and the highway. These front amenity spaces are often separated from the highway by low walling with brick piers and that is the boundary treatment at the front of the appeal site.

6. No.2A is a bungalow. Immediately to the north of the appeal site is the semi-detached block that includes no.2, and to the south is a block of garages. Vehicular access to no.2A is via an existing dropped kerb cross-over of the footway on College Road, and this access lies next to the dropped kerb cross-over for no.2. Vehicular access to both of the proposed houses would be via the existing cross-over point.
7. Ground level rises to the north along College Road, which causes the appeal site to be at a lower level than no.2. This is reflected in the height of the brick pier between nos. 2A and 2. The pier would restrict views of the footway as vehicles leave the proposed development. However, the access has been in use by occupiers of the existing bungalow and it is not apparent that it (or other examples of high brick piers in the locality) has been unacceptably harmful to highway safety.
8. Each of the proposed dwellings would have an off-street car parking space. The application drawing entitled *Proposed Block Plan* shows one of these parking locations to be between the proposed northern side elevation and the property boundary, with the other parking bay in the front amenity space of the southern dwelling in the proposed semi-detached block.
9. The Council Officer's delegated report on the application confirms that the proposed semi-detached block would be 2.4m from the northern boundary of the appeal site and 1.0m from the southern boundary. The application stage consultation response from the Borough's Transport Projects Officer highlighted that: the proposed parking bay width would be '*...virtually unusable...*'; a vehicle parked in the bay would make it difficult to move a bicycle from the cycle store at the rear of the dwelling to access the highway; the tracking diagram for vehicle movements within the appeal site appears to show them coming into contact with walls and vegetation; and, there is no clear pedestrian path to the front door.
10. *Manual for Streets* supports the use of shared surface/areas in appropriate locations. The vehicle manoeuvring and amenity space in front of the proposed semi-detached block would be a very low speed private residential environment. As such, occupiers of the proposed dwellings and their visitors reasonably would be expected to be able to navigate to the front doors while avoiding harm from moving vehicles.
11. *Manual for Streets* also addresses parking bays. It indicates that a parking bay needs to enclose a rectangular area of 2.4m by a minimum 4.2m. However, the functional width for opening many car doors would be beyond the 2.4m width, which would overlap with the next parking bay. A boundary wall is present between nos.2 and 2A that would restrict the functional width of the proposed parking bay to 2.4m. Consequently, the parking space to the north of the proposed semi-detached block would fail to meet the parking needs of many occupiers of the proposed northern dwelling.
12. College Road is an area with existing parking pressures that have resulted in on-street parking controls. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. The deficiencies in the design of the proposed development would be likely to cause regular vehicle movements and parking activity that vary from those described in the application. These would be likely to result in additional parking pressures on the highway due to difficulties associated with parking on

the appeal site, and if the northern parking bay were to be used, it would be likely to discourage cycling by occupiers of that dwelling.

13. Policy EC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow *Local Plan 2015-2030* ('LP') seeks to secure a more sustainable local travel network by, amongst other things, incorporating design measures and facilities to promote cycling and demonstrating that adverse impacts on the transport network are avoided. For these reasons the application proposal conflicts with LP Policy EC2 and design objectives of the Framework.

Other matters

14. The appeal site lies within the Spring Grove Conservation Area. The Conservation Area includes suburban residential streets with educational, public and some commercial land uses. The proposed dwellings would be on an existing residential land use and the design of the semi-detached block would be sympathetic to the architecture of no.2 and other characteristic buildings in the Conservation Area. As such, the proposed dwellings would preserve both the character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.
15. My attention has been drawn to other parking arrangements in the locality and these were viewed during the site visit. Full details regarding the background to other off-street parking areas in the locality, along with their design and use, are not before me. In any event, each planning application and appeal is considered on its own merits and that is how I have approached this case. Consequently, other parking areas in the locality do not set a precedent in this case.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons above, the design of the proposed development would fail to provide a more sustainable local travel network and it would be unacceptably harmful to highway safety. This conflicts with LP Policy EC2 and relevant national policy. No matters, including the scope of possible planning conditions, have been to outweigh the identified failing, harm and policy conflict. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Clive Sproule

INSPECTOR