
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2017

by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3166570
42, Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7DQ

- 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 Augustine Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 4073/APP/2016/2781, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2016
 - The development proposed is garage extension to accommodate a single car and installation of vehicle crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a garage extension to accommodate a single car and installation of vehicle crossover at 42, Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7DQ in accordance with the terms of application Ref 4073/APP/2016/2781, dated 18 July 2016 and in accordance with 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 approved plans: Site Location Plan Scale 1:000; drawing nos GJ 2016 O5FA and GJ 2016 06A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to the first use of the vehicular access onto Ickenham Road, the visibility splays, electrically operated turntable and the conversion of the existing parking space at the rear of the property into amenity space as shown on drawing no GJ 2016 O5FA shall be provided. Thereafter, such areas must be kept available at all times for those purposes.
 - 5) Prior to the first use of the vehicular access onto Ickenham Road, details of safety strips to be provided and a timetable for their installation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The safety strips shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.
 - 6) No structure or erection exceeding 1 metre in height shall be placed within the visibility splays referred to in condition 4.
-

- 7) No gates shall be installed across the vehicle entrance without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

Main Issues

2. The Council has not raised concern in respect of the proposed extension to the garage. From my observations and on the basis of the evidence before me, I have no reason to reach a different view to the Council regarding this element of the proposal. The main issues in this case are therefore the effect of the proposed vehicle crossover on:
 - highway and pedestrian safety, and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2 storey dwelling set back from Ickenham Road. It is located close to, but outside of the boundary of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.
4. Vehicular parking to the property is currently to the rear. The appellant is seeking to increase the size of the existing garage to the rear of the property and provide vehicular access to the front, off Ickenham Road. This would result in a new vehicle crossover being created onto this road. In order to leave the site in a forward gear, an electronically operated turntable is proposed to the front of the property.

Highway Safety

5. Ickenham Road is a classified road (B466). The Council has advised that it is designated as a Borough Secondary Distribution Road.
6. Amongst other matters, saved Policy AM7 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies (UDP) states that permission will not be granted for development which would unacceptably increase demand on roads or junctions which are already used to capacity; or prejudice the free flow of traffic or conditions of highway or pedestrian safety.
7. The new crossover and driveway would result in vehicles using the site crossing over 2 pavements, one adjacent to the front boundary of the property; the other adjoining the carriageway. However, the proposed turntable would ensure that vehicles exiting and entering the site could do so in a forward gear. Visibility at the access is good in both directions, such that pedestrians and drivers of vehicles in the road would be able to see vehicles using it. Drivers of vehicles using the access would also be able to see pedestrians and other highway users in both directions.
8. Although located close to a mini roundabout junction, the new access would join the highway at a point when vehicles would typically be slowing down to use the roundabout. The appellant has drawn my attention to the Highway Authority's comments which indicate that the proposal would comply with Transport for London's guidelines in respect of distance from junctions. This guidance requires that a minimum distance of 10 metres from a crossover to a junction should be provided. The proposed crossover has been calculated to be 30 metres from the roundabout junction. This is not disputed.

9. Given the above, and that the crossover would serve 1 vehicle parking space to a dwelling, I am not convinced that its use would result in harm to highway or pedestrian safety. I have not been provided with evidence that the Ickenham Road is already used to capacity, or that the existing accesses in close proximity to the appeal site have prejudiced the free flow of traffic in the road or resulted in harm to highway or pedestrian safety. Furthermore, I note that the Highway Authority consider that the proposal has addressed its concerns in respect of an earlier refused planning application¹ for a similar proposal. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to highway or pedestrian safety. There would be no conflict with UDP Policy AM7 or the adopted Hillingdon Design and Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (SPD) in this regard.

Character and Appearance

10. To the front of the dwelling is a hard surfaced area with flower beds to the side. Between the highway and the front boundary wall is a grass verge with trees upon it. I agree with the Council that this forms an attractive feature of this part of Ickenham Road.
11. The new driveway serving the parking area would cut through the grass verge. However, it would be of a limited width (reference is made on the drawings to it being 2.44 metres wide). A substantial amount of grass verge would remain. The highway trees are shown to be retained. The remaining grass verge and trees would serve to soften the appearance of the hardsurfaced area from the road and pavements.
12. In respect of parking in front gardens, the SPD advises to keep hardsurfacing to a minimum, to provide planting to the parking area, and to keep openings in existing walls or fences to a minimum. Where gates are to be provided, these should open inwards or slide behind a wall. The appellant proposes to retain the majority of the front garden wall and has illustrated that new planting would be provided around the parking turntable. The existing low hedgerow is shown to be retained. Such matters would ensure that the proposal would satisfactorily integrate into the street scene.
13. In light of my findings, I consider that the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area. Given this conclusion, I find that no harm would be caused to the setting of the nearby Ruislip Village Conservation Area. Its significance as a heritage asset would be sustained, in accordance with paragraph 131 of the Framework. There would be no conflict with the quality of the built environment objectives of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies, or with the character objectives of UDP saved Policies BE13, BE19, or the tree and landscaping objectives of UDP saved Policy BE38. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with the SPD.

Conditions

14. The Council has indicated that it would like to see a number of conditions imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. A condition is necessary

¹ Ref: 4073/APP/2015/1617

requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of highway safety and the character and appearance of the area. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also necessary to ensure that the materials used for the proposed garage match the existing building. In the interests of highway safety a condition is necessary requiring details of safety strips to be provided, as is a condition preventing obstruction of the visibility splays. However, I have amended the wording of the condition suggested by the Council to reflect the advice from the Highway Authority in its Highway Impact Assessment.

15. The Highway Authority also suggests a condition preventing gates from being installed at the new vehicular entrance. In the interests of pedestrian safety such a condition is necessary to prevent vehicles waiting within the public highway, including upon the footway for the gates to open.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR