



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2022

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government.

Decision date: 22nd November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/21/3289215

64 Chambers Lane, London NW10 2RL

- 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 Nicholas Avgousti against the decision of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/3570, dated 20 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the proposed conversion of single dwellinghouse into 2x self contained flats, subdivision of rear garden, covered cycle storage to rear and waste storage in front forecourt.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the Council's Decision Notice which contains more detail of the different elements requiring planning approval.
3. The application contains a number of elements requiring planning approval. As the Reason for Refusal only relates to the installation and operation of cycle storage, I have only focussed on this element in this letter.
4. The Council's Reason for Refusal as noted on the Decision Notice makes reference to Policy DMP12 of the Brent Development Management Policies 2016. This document and policy DMP12 has been superseded by the adoption of the Brent Local Plan (LP) and specifically Policy BT2, which is mentioned as an emerging policy in the reason for refusal. Given the adoption of the LP, full weight is afforded to the LP, with no further reference being made to the superseded DMP12 Policy.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal provides appropriate cycle storage facilities, suitable for current and future occupiers.

Reasons

6. When proposing cycle storage, LP Policy BT1 Appendix 4 refers to the need to comply with Policy T5 of the London Plan. The London Plan Policy T5 seeks that cycle parking should be fit for purpose, secure, well-located and in accordance with the minimum standards of provision as well as designed and laid out in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS). Amongst a

number of principles, the LCDS seeks that cycling facilities be fit for purpose, secure and well located. With regards to residential cycle parking, Section 8.5.3 of the LCDS seeks to ensure for residential parking that cycle storage is close to the entrance, avoids obstacles such as stairs, multiple doors and narrow doorways less than 1.2 metres wide. The appellant has also drawn my attention to section 3.2.4 of the LCDS which states that a typical cyclist in motion requires 1 metre width including 'wobble room,' however I also note that the table also suggests that larger cycles may require up to 1.3 metres including 'wobble room.'

7. The proposed cycle storage would be located within the rear garden which is accessed via a private passageway to the side of the dwelling which according to the appeal documents would at it's narrowest point be approximately 65-70 centimetres wide for a distance of 11 metres. I appreciate photographs submitted by the appellant which demonstrate that a road cycle with curved handlebars is able to be walked through the passageway, albeit the photos do illustrate that this is very tight indeed and would not be very convenient for the user. I also note that the appellant states that '*bicycle handlebars are rarely in excess of 600mm in width*,' however no official evidence has been provided which would support this claim. Additionally, cycle parking accesses should cater for a range of bicycles and sizes, where for example, mountain bikes are an equally typical bicycle for residential spaces and would typically appear to have handlebars wider than the road bike that is photographed.
8. Whilst it might be appropriate to pass through a door that is less than 1.2 metres, this is a different situation to travelling 11 metres in a confined and narrow accessway with tall masonry walls to either side, and the occasional downpipe narrowing the passageway further. Consequently, the proposed accessway to the cycle storage could not be considered convenient or wide enough for current and future occupiers. The proposal would therefore not provide appropriate cycle parking facilities, being contrary to LP Policy BT1, and London Plan Policy T5 which is supported by the LCDS, as described previously.

Other Matters

9. Reference is made within the Appellant's SoC to cycle parking within the front garden. This has not been proposed by the appellant, was not part of the consultation of the original planning application; and is not a matter under consideration as part of this appeal and therefore the acceptability or discussion of such has not formed part of this decision.

Conclusion

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

J Somers

INSPECTOR