



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2020

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/W/20/3252362

Garage Block West of Lovelace Gardens, Hersham, Walton-On-Thames, KT12 5HJ

- 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 Stephen Sweeting against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/2914 dated 11 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of new storage/garage unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of residents within the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is at the end of Lovelace Gardens where a gravel access leads to garages on land to the rear of several houses. To reach the other garages vehicles must enter through a narrow gap between the front of the appeal site and the kerb in front of 14 Lovelace Gardens. Space within the block of garages is limited such that turning a vehicle is difficult. Consequently, entering the site in forward gear would usually mean leaving the site in reverse.
4. Lovelace Gardens is narrow and there is not enough space for vehicles to park on both sides of the road and still allow the free movement of traffic. Nevertheless, I saw no road markings or signs suggesting that parking on the road is restricted. At the time of my visit there were several cars parked partially on the pavement and on the road, including in front of No 14 which has no off-road parking within its curtilage.
5. The proposal would reduce the width of the access to the block of garages. Even without road-side parking obstructing the access, it would be difficult for vehicles to easily enter and exit. This would cause disruption and inconvenience to those either unable, or finding it difficult, to gain vehicular access to their garages. The need for some vehicles to reverse in and out of the site would cause inconvenience and a not unreasonable fear of accidents for vehicle owners along the street. The limited speed of traffic would be such that road

safety may not be sufficiently compromised to withhold planning permission. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the inconvenience and disruption caused by vehicles attempting to access the site and adjacent land, and the fear of damage to vehicles would be enough to unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

6. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DM7 of Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (April 2015) which requires that access to and from the highway should be safe and convenient and the impact of vehicle and traffic nuisance should be minimised in residential areas, and paragraph 127 of the National Policy Planning Framework (2019) that requires development should create places that are safe and accessible with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR