
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/17/3170425

312 Greenford Avenue, Hanwell, Ealing, London, W7 3AD

- 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 Davina Green against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 164461FUL, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is installation of a vehicle access with associated hardstanding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of a vehicle access with associated hardstanding at 312 Greenford Avenue, Hanwell, Ealing, London, W7 3AD, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 164461FUL, dated 26 August 2016, 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 and Drawing 0206/PP/DP/01 Rev A, dated 27/11/2016.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision notice does not include a reason for refusal. However, a reason for refusal is set out in the Council's officer report that supports this appeal. I have therefore used this as the basis to determine the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Greenford Avenue and is occupied by a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The area is predominantly residential, although I observed that there are some commercial properties. Greenford Avenue is designated as a Local Distributor Road. The proposal seeks to install a vehicle access to allow the appellant to park directly in front of the host dwelling.
 5. The Council has raised concern that the area of hardstanding would result in insufficient space for vehicles to be able to enter and exit the site in a forward
-

gear, causing obstruction to the free flow of traffic, resulting in harm to highway safety. The appellant has not contested that the proposed area of hardstanding does not meet the Council's general guidelines of measuring 10 metres x 8 metres in size and is therefore insufficient to allow a vehicle to turn and therefore enter and exit the vehicular access in a forward gear. It is therefore accepted that vehicles using the proposed access would need to either reverse onto or off the crossover.

6. I accept the Council's view that Greenford Avenue is a busy distributor road. It is, however, subject to a 30 mph speed limit and it was clear that on-street parking is a predominant feature along the road. I observed that there are a significant number of vehicle crossovers in the immediate area, including several directly opposite the appeal site, which are comparable in size to this scheme. Consequently, pedestrians and drivers on Greenford Avenue are therefore already likely to be alert to the potential for vehicles reversing either into or out of private drives and this would not represent an unusual manoeuvre. This could also be said for vehicles manoeuvring to park on the road itself in the vicinity of the appeal site.
7. It was evident from my site visit that there are generous width pavements and a relatively open site frontage directly in front of the appeal site. This would ensure there would be a good level of visibility for oncoming vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, as well as users of the proposed access itself. I am also mindful that the number of vehicle movements associated with one dwelling is unlikely to be of a sufficient frequency to seriously interrupt the traffic flow. Given all of these matters and that the road is subject to a 30 mph speed limit, I consider that the proposal would not materially obstruct the free flow of traffic on Greenford Avenue.
8. The appellant has made me aware of several recent appeal decisions¹ for similar developments a short distance from the appeal site on Greenford Road. The Inspectors of those appeals came to similar conclusions to my own. I consider that this adds weight to my findings.
9. In conclusion, I consider that the scheme would not cause harm to highway safety. Therefore, the proposal complies with Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2015), which sets out that development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network.

Planning Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition is also necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to ensure certainty.

Conclusion

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

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/A5270/D/10/2123583, dated 26 April 2010 / APP/A5270/D/15/3136885, dated 5 February 2016 / APP/A5270/D/15/3010706, dated 9 July 2015 / APP/A5270/D/10/2134455, dated 13 October 2010.