



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/17/3179936 35 Glenwood Close, Harrow HA1 2QN

- 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 Ms Charlene Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0503/17, dated 1 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2017.
 - The development proposed was originally described as '*to create a vehicle crossover. This application is being made due to the fact that this is a maisonette*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the widening of an existing footway crossover at 35 Glenwood Close, Harrow HA1 2QN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/0503/17, dated 1 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: OS Plans 1:500 and 1:1250; and unnumbered plan of proposed crossover.
 - 3) The hard surfacing hereby permitted shall be surfaced either with porous materials, or permanent provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surfacing to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the site.

Procedural matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the header above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details and from my observations on site that the development comprises the widening of an existing footway crossover, rather than the provision of a freestanding crossover. I sought clarification from the parties in respect of the description of development and have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. Whilst the submitted plans show the area to the front of the property as being laid as grass, I saw at my site visit that this has been block paved and that a short length of wall has been built. For the avoidance of doubt, in the absence of details of the block paving and wall, I have dealt with the proposal on the basis of the plans submitted.

Main Issues

4. The main issues for the appeal are the effects of the proposed development on highway safety and on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Highway safety

5. I saw at my site visit that the appeal property is a purpose built flat within a building containing 4 flats. I observed that the buildings on that side of the street have the appearance of semi-detached dwellings, separated by narrow driveways, served by shared footway crossovers.
6. I am satisfied that the modest widening of the footway crossover and provision of a small parking area to the front of the property would give rise to few additional vehicle movements. As the widened crossover would have adequate visibility for vehicles accessing the appeal site, the proposal would not give rise to any appreciable conflict with vehicles or pedestrians on Glenwood Close. The appeal proposal would not therefore be detrimental to highway safety and conflict with Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (HDMP). Policy DM1 is concerned with design, layout, privacy and amenity and sets design and layout considerations which include amongst other things, the arrangements for safe, sustainable and inclusive access and movement to and within the site. It also does not conflict with HDMP Policy DM42 which is concerned with parking standards. Furthermore the appeal proposal does not conflict with the guidance within the Councils Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide 2010 (RDG).

Character and appearance

7. The modest widening of the existing footway crossover proposed by up to 3.6 metres would not result with any overlapping with adjacent crossovers. Consequently, although the resulting crossover would take up a greater proportion of the site frontage of the appeal property than at present, it would not appear out of character with the established pattern of development in the street. The appeal scheme does not conflict therefore with HDMP Policies DM1 and DM42 or with London Plan Policy 6.10B which includes that development proposals should ensure high quality pedestrian environments and emphasises the quality of the pedestrian and street space. The proposal also does not conflict with the RDG in this regard.

Conditions

8. I have attached conditions regarding timescale and specifying the approved plans as that provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition regarding the drainage of the hard surface to ensure that adequate drainage is provided.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR