

From: Sammy Chan <info@ops-surveyors.co.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 12:41 PM
To: NEW West 2 <west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Planning Inspectorate APP/R5510/W/23/3315732: 4 Church Close, UB7 7PY

Dear Cassandra

I would like to address the comments made by the appellant in response to the Local Planning Authority's (LPA) statement.

Firstly, it is important to note that the appellant had already included a comprehensive transport assessment in the original Development Assessment Statement (DAS) submitted to support the application. However, it appears that the LPA may not have taken this assessment into consideration during their evaluation.

Additionally, it is worth emphasizing that the new London Plan 2021 has issued specific guidance regarding parking standards. It is noteworthy that the LPA repeatedly referred to their own standards outlined in Policy DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, rather than incorporating the updated guidelines provided by the London Plan 2021.

For reference, I would like to provide a recap of the Car Parking Provision Requirement outlined in the London Plan 2021:

- Car parking provision

The Local Plan Development Management Policies and Site Allocations and Designations was adopted on 16th January 2020. It therefore pre-dates the London Plan 2021 and therefore the London Plan policies take precedence in determining planning applications.

London Plan Policy T6 provides the general policy approach to be taken in considering the car parking requirements for development proposals. The following criteria are particularly relevant to the current proposals:

A - Car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity.

B - Car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking ('car-lite').

G - Where car parking is provided in new developments, provision should be made for infrastructure for electric or other.

Policy T6.1 provides details on the car parking requirements for residential developments. The following criteria are particularly relevant to the current proposals:

A - New residential development should not exceed the maximum parking standards set out in Table 10.3.

C - All residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles.

E - Large-scale purpose-built shared living, student accommodation and other sui generis residential uses should be car-free.

Criterion E states that sui generis residential uses should be car free. As part of the changes to the Use Classes Order in September 2020 Houses in Multiple Occupation now fall under the heading of sui generis. As such, a case can be made that the proposed 7 room HMO should be a car free development.

Regarding the LPA's parking standards, it should be noted that their current standards are based on a minimum requirement, rather than adhering to the maximum standards outlined in the London Plan 2021. This deviation from the updated London Plan's parking standards contradicts the most recent guidelines and renders the LPA's refusal reason potentially invalid.

Furthermore, the appellant would like to provide further clarification regarding the acceptability of the third parking space, addressing the LPA's concerns regarding its orientation. It is crucial to highlight that the third space actually offers three potential parking options, as follows:

a) As depicted in the provided plans,

b) Parallel to the other two spaces, effectively functioning as one single parking space, or

c) Two spaces arranged parallel to the first two, resulting in a total dimension of 4.8x4.8m.

The careful assessment by the LPA should have uncovered these alternative options, which comply with the required standards. The appellant encourages the LPA to reconsider their assessment and recognize the flexibility and compliance of the proposed parking arrangement.

By acknowledging these options, the LPA can arrive at a fair and accurate evaluation of the parking provision, considering all viable alternatives and their alignment with the applicable standards.

To summarize the appellant's position:

1) The proposal has successfully met the maximum parking standards outlined in T.6.1(C) of the London Plan 2021, which should also be adopted by the LPA

2) The site has the capacity to accommodate up to 4 parking spaces that are easily accessible, fulfilling the aforementioned standards.

3) The LPA should maintain consistency in their Transportation Assessment by utilizing the London Plan 2021 standards for both parking requirements and electric charging points. This is in accordance with their own report on pages 22 and 23, where they applied their own policy for parking standards while incorporating London Plan 2021 Policy T6 for Electric Charging Points.

4) The original submission already satisfied all parking requirements, and any perceived confusion or minor inconsistencies on the part of the LPA can be attributed to these factors.

Additionally, it is important to address the appellant's decision to provide three parking spaces instead of four. The reason behind this choice stems from the appellant's agent's prior experience with the LPA's inconsistent approach to transport assessments. Specifically, in cases where four parking spaces were provided for a 7-bed, 7-person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO), the LPA utilized the London Plan 2021 parking standard to refuse the application, claiming that the parking provision exceeded the maximum standards outlined in the London Plan 2021. It is crucial to note that a situation similar to the current appeal case could arise, leading the appellant to exercise caution and align their parking provision with what they perceived to be the LPA's expectations.

Given this context, it is recommended that the LPA considers the inconsistency in their previous approach and acknowledges the appellant's attempt to adhere to their perceived standards. It would be prudent for the LPA to reevaluate the parking provision in light of this information, ensuring a fair and consistent assessment process for all applications.

Furthermore, in the event that the LPA deems an additional condition necessary for the provision of an electric charging point, the appellant expresses their willingness to comply with such a requirement as a planning condition. They are committed to meeting all necessary criteria and ensuring the proposal aligns with the relevant standards and regulations.

In light of the information presented, the appellant respectfully requests that the inspector conducts a fair assessment and judgment of the case. They believe that there is clear evidence indicating that the proposal meets the required parking standards. It is their hope that the appeal will be allowed, taking into account the comprehensive documentation and arguments presented in support of the proposal's compliance with the applicable requirements.

Kind regards

Sammy Chan BSc(Hons) MRICS MFPWS

OPS Chartered Surveyors

T: 07881457903

E: info@ops-surveyors.co.uk