

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

34

MEMORANDUM

From: Town Clerk.

To: Planning Officer.

Ref: 1/29/FIS/LO'H.

Your Ref:

3rd November 1966.

Planning Appeals
62, Parkhill Road.
46-50, Parkhill Road. ✓

I attach copy letters from the Ministry of Housing and Local Government dated 2nd November 1966, dismissing the above two appeals which were heard on the 23rd August 1966.

22

B. W. Baker

Town Clerk.

Case
66/1
JEW
SKS

APPEAL by F. N. R. (No. 1177) Ltd.,
under Section 29 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1968
against the refusal of the Council to grant permission
under Section 29(1) of the Act
refusing permission for the erection of
thirty-one garages on the rear of Nos. 46 and 48
Parkhill Road, London

STATEMENT

Site

Nos. 46, 48 and 50 Parkhill Road are on the east side of the road, just south of the junction with Tacker Road (National Grid reference TQ 27013510).

The properties comprise lower ground, ground and two floors over, built in pairs, which are now in multiple occupation. Land at the rear extends for distances between the rear wall of the properties and the rear boundary of the site, varying between 110 feet and 135 feet with an average width of 135 feet.

Nos. 46 and 48 are in the ownership of the appellant company, who recently purchased land at the rear of No. 50.

Initial Development Plan

The site comes within an area zoned in the Initial Development Plan for primarily residential purposes at a density of 100 persons per acre and is not shown as programmed for redevelopment.

The area generally is residential in character.

History

On 15th October, 1965 outline application was made for the building of ten self-contained flats and garages on land to the rear of Nos. 46-48 Parkhill Road. The plans showed a four-storey building with garages on the ground floor with a new approach between the main buildings Nos. 46 and 48 Parkhill Road.

By letter dated 24th January, 1966 the Council refused permission for the proposed development for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal constitutes undesirable backland development involving serious problems of overlooking and loss of privacy and would set an unfortunate precedent by encouraging similar development in adjacent properties.
2. There are serious infringements of the daylighting code on the site boundaries adjacent to the gable ends of the proposed building.
3. The proposed arrangements for car parking at the rear of the building are considered inadequate.

On 21st January, 1966 a further application was made for the erection of private lock up garages on land at the rear of Nos. 46, 48 and 50 Parkhill Road. A layout plan only was submitted, which indicated a range of 31 garages approached from a new 12 feet wide carriageway at the side of No. 46. This approach road would involve the removal of an existing garage. A six storey building at the side of No. 48, now in use for residential purposes, is shown to be retained as a garage.

ory (cont'd)

Adjoining owners were notified of the application and numerous letters of objection were received on grounds of loss of amenity due to noise associated with garage activity.

By letter dated 12th May, 1966 the Council refused permission for the proposed development for the following reasons:-

"The proposal represents an excessive concentration of lock-up garages which would be likely to injure the amenities of residents of adjoining properties by reason of visual intrusion, noise, fumes and traffic generation."

The applicants were informed that the Council would be prepared to give favourable consideration to a revised proposal incorporating a reduced number of garages sufficient to accommodate the vehicles of residents of the flats in Nos. 46-50 Parkhill Road. The Council had in mind a range of 12 garages based on one flat per floor for each property.

Observations on Precise Grounds of Appeal

46, 48 and 50 Parkhill Road consists of 22 self-contained flats and it has become a matter of vital need to have at least a garage for each unit. We are also the owners of 1-3 Tacker Road and 62 Parkhill Road where we have a further 21 self-contained flats.

No. 5.

Parkhill Road is to all intent a busy road of private houses and blocks of flats. There are large blocks of Council and police flats without garage or parking space and it is becoming more and more difficult for our tenants to park their cars in the road.

Class III road

We did apply for permission to erect a small block of flats and garages which was refused. But how the Council can object to this now waste land being used to help clear some of the cars now parked in the road is beyond our understanding.

As mentioned in the main Statement these properties consist of four floors each. It is not accepted that the sub-division into small units has in all cases been approved. The Council recognises the need to make provision for off-street parking, but considers that such provision should be distributed throughout the area and not concentrated in large numbers.

The Council appreciates the parking problems in the area which comprises mainly four-storey buildings now converted to multiple residential use and blocks of flats, and has adopted a standard of one garage or parking space for each new residential unit. This standard was originally one space per 4 residential units, and with pre-war development little or no parking was provided.

As mentioned in the informative on the Council's letter dated 12th May, 1966 the Council do not object to the provision of some off-street parking on this site. The Council must also consider what impact the concentration of 31 garages would have on the area and safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties.

Summary

The Council appreciates that the question of car parking in residential areas is a growing problem particularly in those areas of substantial housing built around the turn of the century, which are now in multiple occupation. The Council was objected to too high a concentration of such garage accommodation in the nature of that now proposed, as such concentration would have an adverse effect upon the amenities of surrounding residential occupiers by reason of noise, often late at night. At the same time there is a loss of amenity open spaces for the immediate occupiers of residential accommodation.