
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2017

by K H Child BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3170884
141 Twickenham Road, Isleworth TW7 6AW

- 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 Robert Mason against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01137/141/P2, dated 2 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'dropped kerb and vehicle crossover for access to private driveway.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There is a discrepancy between both the application reference number and date of refusal, as recorded on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice. In the banner heading above I have referred to the application number cited in the decision notice, as this is referenced elsewhere in the appeal documentation. I have also taken the decision date from the Council's formal decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of highway users, cyclists and pedestrians using the adjoining highway network.

Reasons

4. Number 141 Twickenham Road (No 141) is an end of terrace house, with a small front garden. It is positioned on a classified road (A310), close to the junction into the West Middlesex University Hospital site. The carriageway close to No 141 incorporates part of a feeder lane which allows drivers to turn right into the hospital site when travelling north along Twickenham Road. There is a bus stop nearby on the opposite side of the road, and a pedestrian crossing just beyond the hospital junction.
5. Between the front of the appeal site and the main road there is a wide footpath and a lane of designated vehicle parking on a raised kerb. A row of bollards separates the footpath and the parking area. The parking area is subject to

- parking permit restrictions. The main carriageway has a cycle lane adjacent to the raised kerb area.
6. The proposal would involve the creation of a driveway in the front garden of No 141 with capacity for one vehicle, and insertion of a vehicular crossover. Access would be facilitated across the pavement and the raised kerbside parking. This would result in the loss of part of the designated row of parking immediately opposite the driveway access.
 7. The driveway would have insufficient room to turn a vehicle. As such it would be necessary to reverse either into or out of the parking space. The A310 is a busy thoroughfare, and on my site visit in the middle of the day I observed significant levels of traffic using Twickenham Road in the vicinity of the appeal site. The junction into the hospital site was also in heavy use, with queues of traffic waiting to enter and leave the site. I also observed a number of buses arriving and departing from the nearby bus stop. The cycle lane was less heavily trafficked, although I observed a number of users. I also observed that there is a school to the rear of the appeal site, with pedestrian access off Twickenham Road.
 8. Taking account of the proximity of the right hand turning lane, bus stop and hospital junction, and the mix and number of movements in the vicinity, I consider that the proposal would adversely affect highway safety and traffic flow on Twickenham Road. The Council's Transport Officer also highlights that the proposal, as it stands, would provide insufficient visibility splays to ensure the safety of highway users, pedestrians and cyclists, as established in the Council's 'Vehicle Crossovers and Off-Street Parking for Residential Properties' policy document. Part of the southern splay is outside the control of the appellant. Furthermore, cars parked in the adjoining sections of the raised parking area would restrict the visibility of drivers exiting the site, and there is no firm evidence before me that the necessary splays could be secured.
 9. Overall, I therefore conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the safety and convenience of highway users, cyclists and pedestrians on the adjoining highway network. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CC2 and EC2 in the London Borough of Hounslow's Local Plan 2015-2030, insofar as they seek to ensure proposals provide safe movement and access.
 10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other vehicular crossovers and driveways on residential properties in the vicinity. Nonetheless, the existence of other driveways elsewhere does not negate or alter the material harm arising from the proposed scheme. The appeal site is located within a section of dwellings close to the right hand turn facility, where access to driveways is barred by bollards.
 11. The appellant indicates that the current kerbside parking arrangements on Twickenham Road are unsafe. However, on my site visit all of the cars parked along the kerbside were facing the same direction as nearside traffic. Cars parked in this direction would be able to access onto Twickenham Road without crossing two lanes of traffic. Manoeuvring to travel in the opposite direction, whether from the parking area or a driveway, would be more difficult due to the heavily trafficked nature of the road.
 12. I also observed a range of different sized cars parked in the kerbside parking area, and with their wing mirrors tucked in, none were overhanging beyond the

edge of the raised kerb. The Council's parking standards relate to provision within development sites, rather than roadside parking. Furthermore, although in some cases car doors may need to be opened over part of the highway, this is not unusual for street parking. As it would be over the adjoining cycle lane rather than the highway there are likely to be more gaps and opportunities to allow doors to be opened safely, whilst having regard to cyclist safety.

13. On my site visit I observed a number of available places in the kerbside parking area in the vicinity of the appeal site. My site visit took place at lunchtime, and therefore it is likely that pressures on parking may be greater in the evening when residents return from work. Nonetheless, the proposal would not involve the provision of additional parking provision in the locality as it would, as a minimum, result in the loss of one roadside parking place.

Conclusion

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

Katie Child

INSPECTOR