



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3268975

2 Clevedon Gardens, Hounslow, TW5 9TS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Marwaha against London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2020/3865 00276/ADJ2/P1, is dated 8 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of two residential garages to separate land adjoining 2 Cleveland Gardens.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to a planning application that was not determined by the Council within the prescribed period. The Council have subsequently issued a statement for the purposes of this appeal highlighting that it would have refused the application for planning permission. The Council's concerns are that the proposal does not meet their minimum requirements for new garages and the lack of justification for the additional off street parking would not comply with the London Plan Parking Policy. I have had regard to the Council's statement in framing the main issues.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether or not the proposal would meet the Council's requirements for garages; and
 - whether or not the proposal would meet the requirements for off street parking with particular regard to the London Plan.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a strip of land to the north of No 2 Clevedon Gardens. The land currently houses a somewhat dilapidated garage with a pitched roof and a pair of wooden doors.
5. The proposal is to replace the existing garage with two new garages. The garages would be sited back to back with one behind the other. One garage would front Clevedon gardens and the other would be accessed via a rear yard/access way which runs behind Clevedon Gardens.

6. The London Borough of Hounslow Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy, October 2016 (RCOPP) states that the internal dimensions of a single garage should be 3 metres wide by 7 metres deep. The proposed garages would be approximately 2.8m by 4.98m and would, therefore, fail to meet the required standards.
7. The RCOPP states that where the aforementioned internal size standards cannot be met it should be demonstrated that alternative storage space, such as a garden shed and cycle parking is available. In this instance I have not been provided with sufficient evidence to persuade me that such alternative provision would be provided.
8. Furthermore, the RCOPP states that garage doors should measure at least 2.4m in width for a single garage. The proposed garage doors would be approximately 1.9m wide and would, once again, fail to meet the expectations set out in the Council's policy.
9. Policy EC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP) states that the Council will secure a more sustainable local travel network that maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and using public transport. The policy sets out the ways in which the Council will achieve their aims. This includes the promotion of car free or low car development and using the car parking standards established in the London Plan.
10. Policy T6 of The London Plan 2021 (The London Plan) states that the maximum car parking standards set out within the plan should be applied to development proposals. These standards set out maximum residential parking standards based on the location and size of the development. In this instance I have been provided with limited evidence with regards to the size of the property and its Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL). However, at most the maximum parking provision set out within the plan is 1.5 spaces per dwelling.
11. The property at No 2 Clevedon Gardens has a garage and off-street parking for at least one car. If the appeal garage is considered the dwelling has around four parking spaces. The proposal would increase this to five which would be well in excess of the maximum standards set out in the London Plan.
12. I note that the red line boundary around the appeal site does not appear to include the garage or parking area directly outside No 2. Nevertheless, even if the appeal site were to be considered entirely in isolation, the proposal would result in an increase in the parking provision from two to three spaces on the appeal site itself.
13. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would fail meet the Council's requirements for garages and would not meet the requirements for off street parking with particular regard to the London Plan. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the RCOPP which sets out the expected size standards for garages. The proposal would also fail to comply with Policy EC2 of the LP and Policy T6 of the London Plan. Amongst other things, these policies strive towards securing a more sustainable travel network and set out the maximum car parking standards.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge that the current scheme has been altered from the previously refused proposal with the aim of overcoming the concerns which were raised.

However, as set out above, in my view the alterations would not overcome the harm I have identified.

15. I have noted a number of other issues raised; including the effect on access to other neighbouring garages. However, as this proposal is going to be dismissed for other reasons and the other concerns expressed do not have a direct bearing on the main issues, it is not necessary for these to be explored further as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would not accord with the development plan when it is considered as a whole and I have not identified any material considerations which indicate that the appeal should be allowed. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR