



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3301510

12 Barra Hall Road, Hayes UB3 2NR

- 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 Grewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 59507/APP/2021/4633, dated 24 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as retention of two units of accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether or not the proposal makes suitable provision for car parking.

Reasons

3. Both Policy T6.1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMT6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (the DMP) set out maximum residential parking standards, which in Outer London areas with a poor level of public transport accessibility such as this, equates to 3 car parking spaces (1.5 spaces per unit). Policy DMT6 requires compliance with the parking standards unless any variance would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity.
4. The drawings show the provision of 2 off-street car parking spaces within the existing area of hardstanding at the front of the site, which the appellant contends is sufficient to meet the parking demand for the development based on an analysis of average car ownership level data for the ward area. However, even if I were to accept that position without having sight of the information being referred to, I have no substantive evidence to demonstrate how the proposed parking arrangement would work in practice. In particular, it is not clear how a vehicle could manoeuvre into the parking space along the western boundary if another vehicle was already present in the other parking space along the northern boundary.
5. There is a suggestion that the area along the northern boundary is large enough to accommodate two vehicles by itself, but again, I have no evidence to demonstrate how this could be achieved in practice. I note that the existing porch is not shown on the site plan and would likely affect the potential of a side-by-side parking arrangement being achieved in this part of the site.

Furthermore, even if the area is long enough to accommodate a parallel parking arrangement, this form of parking layout would not be appropriate for a development of separate households where unrelated occupants would each have different movement patterns.

6. Consequently, whilst the level of parking provision would not exceed the relevant maximum parking standards, its layout would, in my judgement, be impractical, such that there would be a shortfall in parking provision for the development.
7. I have considered whether the shortfall in parking provision could alternatively be met on-street. The appellant states that site visits undertaken have revealed that Barra Hall Road and the surrounding streets do not suffer from any parking issues. However, I have no information of the number, time, and duration of these observations. Parking demand will likely vary during the day and throughout the week so snapshot observations are not a sufficient measure of parking stress. A neighbouring resident has complained of nuisance being caused by vehicles being parked across other properties and close to the road junctions in the vicinity of the site. Without robust evidence, such as a parking survey, to demonstrate that there is sufficient on-street capacity to accommodate the overspill parking, particularly at peak times, the proposal could potentially have an adverse impact on street parking and cause inconvenience for residents in the area.
8. In light of all the above, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would make suitable provision for parking. There is conflict with Policy DMT6 of the DMP in so far as it requires compliance with the adopted parking standards unless any variance would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework where it requires that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

9. Through the use of conditions, the front boundary hedge could be maintained at an appropriate height to achieve suitable visibility at the site entrance, whilst electric vehicle charging points and cycle storage facilities could be provided within the site. I also recognise that the proposal would add to the supply and choice of housing in the area. However, these objectives and the limited benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the failure to comply with the policies of the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR