



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/22/3297349

53 Meadway, Twickenham, TW2 6PG

- 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 Robinson & Buckley against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/3844/HOT, dated 7 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are as follows:
 - The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area
 - The effect of the proposals on highway safety

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Meadway is a residential street characterised by terraced and semi-detached two storey houses constructed around the 1930s. These are set behind front gardens which are in some cases being used for off-street parking. Of those which do not have a driveway or off-street parking, they are dependent on the availability of on street parking to serve occupiers and visitors.
4. The appeal property, No 53, is a semi-detached dwelling which has been subject to a large side extension, giving it a wide frontage to the street. Directly adjacent to the property is the main entrance to the Trafalgar Infant School and Crane Community Centre which provides both vehicular and pedestrian access, and this is partly protected by zig-zag lines from inappropriate parking. At the site visit, I could see that the front boundary fence to the appeal property had been removed and gravel covering the entire front garden area.
5. The Twickenham Village Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) states that one of the threats to the Meadway (and wider Character Area 2) are 'poorly-defined boundaries as a result of the removal of

front garden walls for off-road parking.' Further, the document also seeks to 'Encourage the retention and reinstatement of front gardens.'

6. Policy LP1 (Local Character and Design Quality) of the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018) (LP) seeks development that is aligned to the established local character 'including the relationship to existing townscape, development patterns ... local grain and frontages.'
7. I note the appellants aim to construct a wall to the new frontage, on order to replace the previous timber fence and I consider this would be a positive benefit to the character and appearance of the area. I also consider that concerns over the reinstatement of landscaping could be addressed via an appropriately worded planning condition, together with the same to ensure permeable surfaces would be used.
8. In light of this, I do not find harm to the character and appearance of the area, nor Policy LP1 and limited offence to the relevant parts of the Twickenham Village Planning Guidance SPD.

Highway Safety

9. Meadway is a busy street lined by a significant amount of unallocated on-street car parking, which I could see at the site visit is in high demand. The street is subject to a restricted resident permit parking scheme which requires a permit to be displayed for parking during Monday to Saturday between 8:30am and 6:30pm.
10. The appeal property already benefits from a single vehicle access via a dropped kerb from the street, which is marked by a double yellow line which prevents on-street parking blocking the driveway. I can therefore see that the appellant could access parking to the front of their dwelling via this point. The appeal proposals would result in the significant widening of this opening to around 4.8m. This would reduce the amount of on street parking available to the frontage of the appeal property.
11. LP45 (Parking Standards and Servicing) of the LP seeks to resist the '*provision of front garden car parking unless it can be demonstrated that: a. there would be no material impact on road or pedestrian safety; b. there would be no harmful impact on the character of the area, including the streetscape or setting of the property, in line with the policies on Local Character and Design; and c. the existing on-street demand is less than available capacity*'.
12. The Transport Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (Transport SPD) seeks to resist a net increase in pavement crossovers. In justifying this, it states at paragraph 12.1 that '*Crossovers reduce pedestrian priority, detract from the even-ness of the footway, result in the loss of communal kerbside parking and make the provision of segregated cycle lanes, bus lanes and bus stops more difficult.*'
13. In concluding on this, it is clear to me that the proposal would result in the loss of much needed on-street car parking, together with a decrease in pedestrian priority, which in my view is particularly undesirable directly adjacent to the access to a primary school which will at certain times of the week attract significant pedestrian movements past the appeal site. I therefore conclude that the proposals would not comply with Policy LP45 nor the relevant parts of the Transport SPD.

14. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties which have a dropped kerb giving frontage off street parking with no green boundaries in place. There are no details before me as to whether these other dropped kerb arrangements have been granted planning permission.
15. Further, I am aware that the Transport SPD also states that '*The presence of crossovers nearby should not be considered as a precedent because crossovers nearby, where lawful, would have been installed under a previous policy context and street parking supply becomes more limited as the numbers of crossovers increase.*' (ibid.)
16. Notwithstanding this, I have determined this appeal on its own merits, and the presence of other dropped kerbs nearby does not, in my view, provide a justification for the harm that I have identified, that would result from the proposed development.

Conclusions

17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR