

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2016

by **C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 10<sup>th</sup> October 2016

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3154688**

**Pavement adjacent to 705 Field End Road, South Ruislip, Harrow, Middlesex HA4 0RH**

- 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 Brian O'Riordan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 71575/APP/2016/386, dated 1 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2016.
  - The development proposed was originally described as "Dropped kerb and crossover to provide a domestic vehicle crossover for 705 Field End Road, South Ruislip."
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a vehicular access at pavement adjacent to 705 Field End Road, South Ruislip, Harrow, Middlesex HA4 0RH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 71575/APP/2016/386, dated 1 February 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1516-100000-001 Location Plan, 1516-100000-002 Block Plan, 1516-100000-003 Proposed Vehicular Crossover Layout.

### Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, the proposed act of development is the formation of a means of access to the highway. The appeal proposal would therefore more appropriately be described as a vehicular access. This revised description would not prejudice the parties involved, and I have therefore considered the appeal on that basis.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety.
-

## Reasons

4. The majority of houses between 695 and 725 Field End Road have vehicular accesses to the front. The front boundary of the house at 705 Field End Road is open and the area to the front of the property is hard surfaced. The appeal proposal seeks planning permission for the creation of a vehicular access in this location, which would be served by the formation of a dropped kerb and crossover within the highway.
5. The established residential use of No 705 is not likely to generate a large number of vehicle movements, and I have no evidence that the appeal proposal would increase trip generation. At the time of my site visit, which took place during the middle of the day, traffic flows were steady and moderate in both directions and drivers appeared to be observing the speed limit. Pedestrian flows on the footway on the east side of Field End Road were light.
6. There are double yellow lines on the west side of Field End Road, but no parking restrictions on the east side adjacent to the appeal site. During my site visit I noted that the east side of the road is well used for on-street parking. I observed that this existing situation gives rise to vehicles stopping in the road and reversing into on-street spaces. There is no evidence that the proposed development would increase the number of vehicle manoeuvres on the road. Manoeuvres associated with cars parking on-street or within the curtilage of properties on Field End Road may result in a temporary slowing of traffic. However, I have no evidence that such short-term disruptions to the free flow of traffic have given rise to any road safety concerns.
7. Field End Road is fairly broad and reasonably straight and level in the vicinity of the appeal site, thereby affording good visibility. Given the number and frequency of existing vehicular accesses along this section of the road, drivers and pedestrians would be aware of the possibility that vehicles may manoeuvre in and out of No 705 and would thus exercise caution accordingly. Those seeking to use the proposed vehicular access would likewise be mindful of other road users and pedestrians.
8. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety. As such, the appeal proposal would accord with the highway safety aims of Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies and the Supplementary Planning Document Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions.

## Conditions

9. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

## Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*C L Humphrey*

INSPECTOR