The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/20/3244323
Basement + Ground Floor Flat, 231a South Lambeth Road, London SW8 1XR

- 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 Dan Newbury against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref 19/02290/FUL, dated 17 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2019.
- The proposed development is new double garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on traffic congestion and sustainable transport movements.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is situated on the eastern side of South Lambeth Road, a busy road that runs north-south between Stockwell and Vauxhall. The site has a rear access onto Saddlers Way, a private road which runs parallel to South Lambeth Road. The southern access to Saddlers Way lies adjacent to the junction of South Lambeth Road and Lansdowne Way, which I observed during my site visit to be a busy junction. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 6a, and so has an excellent level of access to public transport services. The site is within a controlled parking zone, and it is understood that the appellant has the right to apply for a parking permit.

5. Policy T7 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) states that development in areas where there is a high level of access to public transport services should be car-free. The wording of the policy is explicit in that it applies to all forms of development, not just new houses, and particularly within areas with high PTAL scores. It is therefore the case that the policy requirement applies to this development, and particularly in this highly accessible location.

6. The explanation given in the supporting text as to what constitutes car-free development says it comprises developments where no on-site parking is provided and where residents would be excluded from the Council's residents' parking permit scheme. By providing two spaces on site, the proposal would clearly not be car-free.

7. I accept that due to the appellant's existing entitlement to a parking permit, the current dwelling is not car-free. Nonetheless, accounting for that existing entitlement, the proposal would potentially allow the appellant to park three vehicles within the site and surrounding area. A net increase of two vehicles could result in increased traffic congestion, particular given that nearby junctions and roads are already in heavy use, and would clearly be contrary to the Council's aim of promoting sustainable modes of transport by minimising parking provision. As no evidence or justification for the proposed parking spaces has been provided, the proposal would be contrary to Policy T7.

8. I understand that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impact upon highway safety in so far as the visibility from the garage onto Saddlers Way. Nonetheless, I have found that the proposal would be unacceptable for reasons stated above.

9. While there are similar garages along Saddlers Way, the details and circumstances of these garages are not before me to consider. Regardless, each appeal must be considered on its own merits, and I have found the proposal that forms the subject of this appeal to be unacceptable for reasons set out above.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to traffic congestion and sustainable transport movements. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy T7 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015).

Other Matters

11. The Council raise no objection to the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the South Lambeth Road Conservation Area, and I have no reason to arrive at a different view.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR