

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20TH December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3158077

21 Richmond Road, Isleworth, TW7 7BS

- 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 Miss Valerie Lockwood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00937/21/P2 dated 11 May 2016 was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the formation of vehicular access to the front of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of vehicular access to the front of the house at 21 Richmond Road, Isleworth, TW7 7BS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00937/21/P2 dated 11 May 2016 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: Site Location Plan, L0960 2, P1544/DK/01, P1544/DK/02, P1544/DK/03 and P1544/DK/04.

Procedural Matter

2. I have utilised the description of development from the LPA's decision notice, which more accurately describes the proposal than the application form.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-terrace property which is situated on the western side of Richmond Road. The appeal property is accessed off a lay-by (slip) road which turns to meet the main Richmond Road at the front of the appeal site. A number of properties on this side of the road have dropped kerbs providing off-road parking provision. Parking restrictions consisting of single yellow lines are in place outside the appeal property and a disabled parking bay is positioned a short distance to the south.
-

5. The proposal seeks to provide a new vehicular crossing which would facilitate parking within the property's curtilage. Although I note that some parts of the appeal application submission indicate that the disabled parking bay is to be relocated, it is clear from other supporting plans¹, including those referenced by the Council on the refusal notice, that it had been re-located at the time of the Council's decision, which I was also able to see at the time of my visit. The submitted scaled plans illustrate the swept paths of a family sized car entering and leaving the site, without hindrance, even with a similar sized car parked in the nearby disabled bay.
6. The Council have also raised concerns about the corner location of the appeal site and the close proximity of the proposal to the junction of the slip road to the main Richmond Road. The submitted computer drawn swept path plans indicate that a vehicle reversing out of the proposed driveway would not be within a 5 metre buffer zone of the junction and that a vehicle entering the slip road from the main Richmond Road, would not come into conflict with a vehicle undertaking such a reversing manoeuvre out of the appeal site. Similarly, vehicles travelling north along the slip road would see a vehicle reversing from the appeal site and would be travelling slowly as they approached the bend before the junction. I acknowledge the nature of the junction, including the busy Richmond Road and the curvature of the slip road but from the evidence before me, I have no reason to consider that the proposal would not provide safe access to and from the site.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on highway safety. Of the Policies quoted within the refusal notice, I consider Policies CC2 and EC2 of the Council's Local Plan to be of most relevance. The proposal would not be contrary to these policies, which seek, amongst other matters, to accommodate movement and car parking in a safe and usable way. There would also be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks, amongst other matters, safe and suitable access (Paragraph 32).
8. Although the full details of the previous appeal decision² are not before me, it is clear that accurate scaled plans of the proposal were not before that Inspector and the disabled bay had not been relocated. I can confirm that I have considered the appeal before me on its own merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

10. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. In addition to the standard time condition, a condition is required to secure compliance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

¹ Drawing No: P1544/DK/01

² APP/F5540/D/15/3135030