



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/20/3248299

1 Rodwell Place, Harrow HA8 6JX

- 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 S Karim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4337/19, dated 23 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is single car parking space together with hard and soft landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the description of development changed and I have therefore used the description shown on the council's decision notice for the purposes of clarity and precision.
3. I note from the application form and appeal form the appellant's names are different, but written confirmation has been received from Mr Karim that the appeal is to be made in his name. I have therefore proceeded on that basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is whether the proposals constitute sustainable development.

Reasons

5. Rodwell Place is a small, modern residential apartment development located to the rear of a number of commercial premises fronting Whitchurch Lane. It is accessed via a vehicular passageway, which is also used by other neighbouring commercial operators.
6. The appeal site falls within Edgware Town Centre, and it is located within walking distance of a range of higher order services and facilities including shops, supermarket, cafes and restaurants as well as a local school and the Edgware Underground Station to the north east. Whitchurch Lane itself is also well served by bus stops.

7. To the front of the development are three parking bays with various areas of hard surfacing. The development has some limited areas of amenity space and a bin store serving the occupiers of the dwellings.
8. Policies 6.3 (Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity); 6.9 (Cycling); 6.13 (Parking) of the London Plan (LP) and paragraph 109 of the Framework seek to promote the use of sustainable travel modes, reducing car travel and trip lengths.
9. The addendum to Chapter 6 of the London Plan also includes maximum parking standards for new development, depending on use and relative sustainability. In areas of good public transport accessibility, such as Edgware, it is stated that decision makers should aim for '*significantly less*' than one space per residential unit. It also states that 20% of all spaces must be for electric vehicles. Policy DM42 (Parking Standards) of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) (DMP) reinforces the standards set in the LP and also set out that proposals for development that would diminish the convenience of pedestrians and cyclists will be resisted.
10. The appellant claims that the area has become a 'battleground' for car parking more recently and I could see at the site visit that car parking is at a premium within the local area. Parking is strictly controlled along Whitchurch Road and available only in very limited locations. I observed that there is very little parking in neighbouring residential streets such as Mead Road, which has restrictions in favour of resident permit holders.
11. The proposed development would clearly improve the level of car parking being offered to occupiers of the apartments. However, the appeal site is in a highly accessible location and to provide more parking spaces would not result in a parking ratio '*significantly under one space per residential unit*', nor would it encourage more sustainable modes of travel to be used.
12. It is not clear from the appellants drawings whether secure cycle storage would be provided as part of the development and I find this a significant shortcoming of the proposals. To provide a further parking space would, in any case, reduce the available area of land that could be used to provide secure cycle storage for all residents.
13. I therefore consider the appeal proposals to be in conflict with the aims and objectives of Policies 6.3, 6.9 and 6.13 of the LP, as well as Policy DM42 of the DMP and paragraph 109 of the Framework.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR