
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3165486
182 Joel Street, Pinner, Middlesex HA5 2PE

- 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 Hrand Assatourians against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 34882/APP/2016/2350, dated 15 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of a domestic vehicle crossing with white line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a domestic vehicle crossing with a white line at 182 Joel Street, Pinner, Middlesex HA5 2PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 34882/APP/2016/2350, dated 15 June 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 plan: 10433/KE/P1.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the safety of highway users.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a hardsurfaced parking area at the front. It is situated on a wide, well-lit suburban road subject to a 30mph speed limit. An existing crossover around 2 metres wide facilitates joint vehicular access to the parking area and the adjacent dwelling.
 4. The public footway is reasonably wide and straight at the front of the appeal property and for considerable distance in either direction. The appeal property has a largely open frontage. In the main, there is no physical boundary separating the parking area from the footway and ground levels are similar. Therefore, pedestrians using the footway enjoy a good level of visibility in the vicinity of the appeal property. Consequently, they could reasonably be expected to have an advanced warning of any vehicles leaving the appeal property. Similarly, given the levels of visibility available, drivers wishing to
-

leave the appeal property could generally be expected to have an advanced awareness of pedestrians approaching along the footway.

5. I understand that at times, vehicles park on the road in proximity to the existing crossover. The reduction in the views of passing traffic restricts the warning that pedestrians would have of a vehicle intending to enter the appeal property from the carriageway. It also reduces the visibility available for drivers using the existing crossover, thereby making entering or leaving the appeal property more difficult.
6. The proposal would widen the existing crossover by a further 3.7 metres. Whilst as a consequence the widened crossover might be considerably wider than the Council's standard crossing dimensions, there would be no other physical changes to the appeal property. Therefore, the proposal would not result in any obvious reduction in the current levels of inter-visibility between pedestrians and drivers using the existing crossover. As a result, there is no firm evidence to suggest that the proposal would represent a significant hazard for pedestrians including the elderly or children.
7. Moreover, the proposal would potentially reduce on-road parking in the vicinity of the appeal property. This would give pedestrians more advanced warning of vehicles wishing to enter the appeal property, as well as increasing the visibility available to drivers using the widened crossover. This could be regarded as a modest improvement in terms of highway safety over the existing situation. Taking all of the above matters into account, I find that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the safety of highway users.
8. Consequently, the proposal would accord with saved Policy AM7 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, as it would not prejudice conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety. It would also accord with the guidance in the Council's adopted 'Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document as there would not be an unacceptable danger to pedestrians from the widened crossover.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard commencement condition I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plan, in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR