



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3238149

3 Lawrence Grove, Uxbridge, UB10 0FF

- 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 Chris Greehy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73646/APP/2019/1689, dated 18 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is 'rear single storey extension and conversion of rear of existing garage to habitable room'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a rear single storey extension and conversion of rear of existing garage to habitable room at 3 Lawrence Grove, Uxbridge, UB10 0FF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref:73646/APP/2019/1689, dated 18 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1003-01, 1003-02, 1003-03, 1003-04.

Procedural Matters

2. It appears that the development has already taken place, but I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The effect of removal of a garage parking space on public and highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a modern, two storey, three-bedroom, garage linked house. Each property on the estate has dedicated off-street parking for two cars; in the case of No 3 this comprises one space in the garage and one on the adjacent driveway. There are a small number of additional unallocated parking spaces along Lawrence Grove, most of which were in use at the time of the site visit in the early afternoon. Parking along the remainder of the street is prohibited by double yellow lines and frequent signs state that the land has

enforced parking restrictions, including the requirement for a permit to park on the roadway. These restrictions extend to the wider estate.

5. Policy AM14 applies adopted car parking standards, which require that a maximum of two off-street parking spaces be provided for a three-bedroom dwelling with curtilage parking; this can be reduced depending on location, accessibility and highway circumstances. I give weight to good public transport links in the area and the appellant's statement that they have not been using the garage for parking as a recognised common practice (Manual for Streets, DfT 2007). I have considered Policy DMT 6 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) as it is at an advanced stage towards adoption, which carries forward the thrust of the saved policies above, notably that the number of parking spaces is a maximum and does not imply a minimum level. I therefore consider it is reasonable to reduce the number of off-street parking spaces from the maximum stipulated in Policy AM14 to one space, given these specific circumstances.
6. The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) requires that development only be permitted where it will not unacceptably prejudice the free flow of traffic or conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety (Policy AM7). Policy DMT 6 of the emerging Local Plan will require that the number of parking spaces should only be varied if there is no deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity. I give significant weight to the fact that an off-street parking space remains attached to the property, which provides appropriate provision. Inappropriate parking that could unacceptably prejudice the free flow of traffic or highway and pedestrian safety in conflict with Policy AM7 should be prevented by the stringent parking restrictions on the estate.

Conclusions

7. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
8. The commencement condition is not considered necessary as the development has already taken place, but conditions to control the use of matching materials and accordance with the approved plans are necessary in the interests of preserving local character and appearance, and good planning.

B Davies

Inspector