



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3228114 14 Nursery Waye, Uxbridge UB8 2BJ

- 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 K Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73382/APP/2019/456, dated 6 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is to convert the existing semi-detached property into two one-bedroom two-person flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of an existing semi-detached property into two one-bedroom two-person flats at 14 Nursery Waye Uxbridge UB8 2BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 73382/APP/2019, dated 6 February 2019, 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 approved plan PL/14NW/01 rev G.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Details of facilities to be provided for the screened storage of refuse bins within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter the facilities shall be permanently retained.
 - 5) A detailed scheme for boundary walls, fences or other means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the boundary walls, fences or other means of enclosure shall be erected before the development hereby permitted is occupied in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide adequate off-street car parking.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house in a relatively narrow residential cul-de-sac. 14 Nursery Waye (No 14) is situated near to the end of the street,

close to a primary school. The houses along Nursery Waye are set back from the road behind front gardens, the majority of which are used for parking of at least one vehicle.

4. Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012 (UDP) and accompanying Annex 1 contain the Council’s adopted parking standards. For flats, the standard is 1.5 spaces per unit, meaning that the parking requirement for the proposal is 3 spaces. Having regard to the preamble to Policy AM14, Annex 1 and the planning officer’s delegated report, it is not entirely clear as to whether the residential parking standards should be treated as a minimum or maximum. That said, the Council agree that two spaces would be an appropriate number. The Council’s concern is that the site cannot satisfactorily accommodate two spaces.
5. The plans submitted with the application indicate that 2 parking spaces would be provided in the existing front garden with an anti-slip ramp to allow access to the entrance to flat 1. Although the front garden is not particularly large, having regard to parking at neighbouring properties, it was apparent during my site visit that the garden has sufficient depth to accommodate an average sized car without infringing on the pavement or unacceptably obstructing access to the front door. Accommodating two spaces side by side would be achievable as shown on the plans. The site is therefore deep enough and wide enough to accommodate 2 standard sized parked cars.
6. It would be necessary to install a crossover to enable use of the front garden for parking and this is shown on the submitted plans. This would not meet the Council’s guidelines due to the greater length of the proposed dropped kerb and the reduced length of kerb up stand between it and the adjacent existing crossover. However, other properties in the street have dropped kerbs along their full frontages. Given that the appeal property is located close to the end of a no-through road where vehicle speeds would be expected to be slow, this would not present a risk to pedestrian safety.
7. Opportunities for on-street parking outside the property are restricted. Parking is controlled on Nursery Waye during working hours on week days, with a single yellow line on the road outside the appeal property. As a result, the proposed development would not result in undesirable and injudicious parking on the highway. Enforcement of parking restrictions is a matter for the Council and issues relating to this have not affected my consideration of this appeal.
8. I note the comments of the neighbour in respect of vans being parking at the property which overhang the curtilage, and the problems caused by this. However, whilst the proposed parking spaces may not be deep enough for a large vehicle, they would meet the Council’s standards and are therefore acceptable.
9. The existing extensions are not part of this appeal proposal. Issues relating to the structure of the building including the extensions, drainage and the proposed alterations to form flats are controlled by Building Regulations. I note comments from the neighbour about inconvenience during construction but this would be for a temporary period.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would provide adequate off-street car parking. It complies with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – UDP Saved Policies 2012 and accompanying adopted parking

standards as well as the HDAS Supplementary Planning Document 2006. In combination, these policies seek to maintain the free flow of traffic, prevent harm to highway safety, and comply with the Council's parking standards.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty I have imposed a condition requiring that development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials used to match those in the existing building. I have also added conditions requiring details of screened refuse storage areas and boundary treatments, as suggested by the Council, in the interests of certainty and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development. Details of cycle storage arrangements have been provided on the approved plan so further details are not necessary. Sound proofing is covered by Part E of the Building Regulations, so I have not imposed the Council's suggested condition relating to this.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR