



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2017

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3179349

1 Westdale Road, Woolwich SE18 3BQ

- 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 A Al Jenabi against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0391/F, dated 3 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is garage conversion and conversion of existing covered yard/store area at rear to habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council's reason for refusal refers to insufficient evidence being provided to justify the loss of the parking space. The officer's report says that in light of this, and the heavy demand for parking locally, the development would detrimentally affect existing residents and businesses. Therefore the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the efficient operation of the highway network which serves local residents and businesses.

Reasons

3. The property comprises a small end of terrace dwelling which was undergoing renovation at the time of my site visit. The proposal would include the loss of the existing garage and would result in the property changing from a three bedroom to a four bedroom house.
4. Though the site is close to the shops on Herbert Road, and other nearby facilities, the Council state the site has a PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) score of 2 which suggests access to frequent public transport services is poor. As such, the London Plan advises a maximum of two parking spaces for a four bedroom dwelling in a suburban area such as this. Although I note the support for car-free, or low parking provision, development in Policy 6.13 of the London Plan, this site would not be a suitable location for this, and a requirement for two spaces is reasonable.
5. There are no parking restrictions on Westdale Road and Eglinton Road and at the time of my visit there were few spaces to be found on either road near the site. There are a few parking spaces in an area at the end of Westdale Road,

amidst some flats, which also appear to be uncontrolled and were mostly occupied at my visit. Overall, though generally unrestricted, the availability of on-street parking provision in the immediate vicinity is very limited.

6. I recognise that the constrained width of Westdale Road and the proximity of the garage to the pavement means that it would be difficult for cars to manoeuvre into the garage. The short steep ramp between the garage door and the road adds a further impediment. Furthermore, the garage's width is minimal and although it would be possible to enter it and park, exiting the car would be difficult in all but small cars. In summary the difficulty of using the garage means it does not provide a convenient parking space, but I do not consider it is wholly unusable.
7. Nevertheless, even if the garage is impractical and so its loss inconsequential, the intensification of the use of the property, by virtue of the additional bedroom, would be likely to put additional pressure on nearby on-street parking. In the context of the limited availability of on-street parking, any additional pressure could lead to cars parking in positions which would adversely affect the efficient operation of the highway network in close proximity of the site.
8. Consequently the development would not accord with Policy IM(c) of the Core Strategy and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan which sets parking standards which aim to balance the need to support alternative modes of travel with the need for parking and hence, among other things, address congestion.
9. The fact that two of the other properties in the terrace have undergone similar conversions does not justify development that would harmfully affect the operation of the highway.
10. The Council raise no objection to the conversion of the yard/store, and I have no reason to disagree. However, this part of the proposal is not severable from the garage conversion hence I am unable to grant planning permission for it separately.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR