



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2020

by R. Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3250280

14 Green Lane, Worcester Park KT4 8AF

- 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 Ali against the decision of London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2019/01925, dated 14 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatory and detached garage and erection of a semi-detached 2 bedroom two storey dwellinghouse with refuse, cycle parking and off street parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice and appeal form as it provides a more accurate description than the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the parking and vehicular access of the donor house.

Reasons

4. No.14 Green Lane (No.14) is a two-storey detached house located on a short section of Green Lane between two crescents of houses, Brookside Crescent and Beverley Gardens. The appeal proposal is to demolish the existing conservatory and garage associated with No.14 and construct a semi-detached house. The proposed house would have an integral garage which would be accessed from the front of house via the existing dropped kerb to Green Lane.
5. The existing parallel forecourt parking to the front of No.14 is shown on the proposed ground and first floor plans, and described in the Design and Access Statement, as being retained for the donor house. In front of No.14, Green Lane narrows to a single carriageway to provide a pedestrian refuse and speed table. The extended width of pavement includes a parking sign and bollards at either end between which, at the back edge of the original kerb line, are two street trees. Whilst it may be possible to squeeze a car between the two trees to independently access the existing parking space, this would require

manoeuvring over and through the pedestrian refuse. Although cars would be moving at a slow speed, these movements would nonetheless risk pedestrian and highway safety.

6. In order to access the parking space by the existing dropped kerb, the occupiers of No.14 would need to use the forecourt area to the front of the proposed new house. This area is shown on the proposed ground and first floor plan as '*No parking communal access only*' but ensuring that this remains clear and that cars associated with the new house are not parked here would be very difficult to control. It is likely therefore that there would be the car movements over the pedestrian refuse I describe above, or an increase in on-street parking.
7. The appellants Grounds of Appeal refer to the consideration of parking based on local circumstances and the public transport accessibility of the site. I note that the site is referred to as being either within PTAL 2 or 3 and I saw from my site visit that there is good access to shops and bus services, particularly on Central Road. However, I also saw from my site visit that this part of Green Lane is already heavily parked, particularly on the western side and on Brookside Crescent and Beverley Gardens. I have no evidence before me that the parking arrangement proposed for the donor house would not increase on-street parking pressure, exacerbating this existing problem.
8. Whilst the provision of an additional two-bedroom house is a material consideration I afford significant weight, in this case, it would not outweigh the harm I find to the parking and vehicular access for the donor house. The proposals would therefore conflict with Policies 36 and 37 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 (2018) (LP) because the impact on the highway has not been assessed, it would increase on-street parking and cause harm to highway and pedestrian safety.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR