



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2010

by Terry G Phillimore MA MCD MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government**

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Decision date:
9 September 2010**

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/10/2119810

164 Iverson Road, London NW6 2HH

- 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 A Matsoukis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2009/1471/P, dated 24 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2009.
- The development proposed is remove existing driveway and replace with new brick/block driveway and associated works.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for construction of new driveway and dropped kerb following the demolition of a section of the existing side boundary wall at 164 Iverson Road, London NW6 2HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2009/1471/P, dated 24 March 2009, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:200 location plan, Existing Revision B, Proposed Revision B, Typical Driveway Details (Section).

Procedural matter

2. The appellant has adopted the Council's revised description of the proposal as being 'construction of new driveway and dropped kerb following the demolition of a section of the existing side boundary wall'. Since this accurately describes the proposal I also use it in my decision.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect the proposal would have on on-street parking conditions in the vicinity.

Reasons

4. The property is on the corner with Medley Road, which is a cul-de-sac. The access to the proposed parking space at the end of the rear garden would be from that road. The edge of the carriageway is used for parking, but individual bays are not marked. The Council suggests that the new crossover would result in the loss of one or possibly two on-street spaces. This could vary
-

depending on the arrangement of parked vehicles at any time, but with the width of the crossover I consider that the effect would generally be to reduce the amount of available on-street parking by one space.

5. The site lies within a Controlled Parking Zone. The Council asserts that on-street parking stress is already high in the area. It states that, within the CPZ, 89 parking permits have already been issued for every 100 estimated parking bays. It suggests this means the CPZ is approaching being highly stressed, with this considered to be overnight demand exceeding 90%.
6. That position therefore does not currently appear to have been reached. Without information on the total number of spaces in the CPZ, I am unable to conclude that the loss of what would most likely be one on-street space in this road would have a material effect on the overall situation in the CPZ.
7. The Council criticises the appellant's suggestion that Medley Road is unusually quiet for the area due to its location and limited number of houses, stating that this is lacking in detailed evidence. However, there is no other quantitative information before me relating to the on-street parking situation in this road. There is therefore no firm evidence to support the assertion in the reason for refusal that the proposal would result in a harmful increase in parking stress within the CPZ. I consider that no conflict is established with policy T9 of the Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006, which seeks to prevent off-street parking which would result in harm including with respect to impact on demand on CPZs.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. I impose a condition specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

T G Phillimore

INSPECTOR