
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Oliver Blower MA (T&CP)

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3172845
186 Worton Road, Isleworth TW7 6EP

- 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 Quang Hoang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01239/186/P2, dated 21 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2017.
 - The proposed development is described as “drop kerb”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a mid-terrace house with a small paved front garden facing Worton Road. I observed at my visit that the footway is well used by pedestrians. The proposal seeks to drop the kerb in front of the house and create a vehicular crossover.
 4. The development plan includes the Hounslow Local Plan (LP). Policy EC2 of the LP expects development proposals to demonstrate that adverse impacts on the transport network are avoided, and requires proposals for vehicle crossovers to be consistent with the Council’s adopted policy on vehicle crossovers.
 5. Further guidance is given in the London Borough of Hounslow Supplementary Planning Document Vehicle Crossovers and Off-Street Parking for Residential Properties (SPD). This requires pedestrian visibility splays of 2.4m by 2.4m at the back of the footway and on both sides of the crossover, and that there must be no obstructions over 600mm high in this area, such as a fence or vegetation.
 6. The parties are in agreement that the site is not sufficiently wide to provide the minimum recommended visibility splays, with part of the splays falling outside the appellant’s control across land at 184 and 188 Worton Road. I note that the front gardens of these houses do not currently have structures in them, however this cannot be guaranteed in the future. I also note No 188 has vegetation within the viability splay that could grow over 600mm in height.
-

7. The proposed development does not provide sufficient space to allow the turning of a vehicle, so a vehicle would either need to reverse into or out of the site. This would result in vehicles with potentially limited visibility – for the reasons given above - reversing over the footway into the path of pedestrians, significantly increasing the risk of collision and injury. As a result I conclude that the proposed vehicular crossover would cause unacceptable harm to the highway safety of pedestrians, contrary to LP policy EC2 and the SPD.
8. I note that there are some similar vehicular crossovers nearby, such as at No 180 Worton Road. However, I do not have the planning history of these sites, and their existence does not set a precedent for development that would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
9. The appellant argues that planning permission would be required for structures in the neighbouring gardens, allowing the Council to consider their effects on visibility. However, the Council would have no control with respect to the height of neighbouring vegetation, nor permitted development, which could obstruct the visibility splays.
10. Consequently, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

O Blower

Appointed Person