
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2017

by Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 31st July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/17/3175227

178 Greenford Road, Greenford UB6 9AS

- 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 Naumaan Qamar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 166297HH, dated 6 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the lowering of a kerb to obtain access to a proposed driveway.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The Council's refusal notice for the application refers to London Plan Policy 6.13, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Policy 6.13 does not however relate to highway safety matters, and I have therefore considered the appeal in the context of the NPPF.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

3. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on highway safety. The appeal property fronts Greenford Road, the A4127. This is a busy west London route which connects the A40 to Southall and the M4 corridor. It also carries a number of bus routes.
4. The appeal property is situated in close proximity to a bus stop, which is to the south of the property on the same side of the carriageway. The property is also situated close to a central refuge in the carriageway, which forms part of a pedestrian crossing point identified by footway paving. Tall traffic beacons mark the crossing within the central refuge, and these serve to give it greater prominence in the highway. Between the appeal property and the bus stop, parking on the highway is prohibited. An access to a garage filling station is located on the opposite side of the carriageway to the appeal property.
5. Roadside parking bays are provided, by markings within the carriageway, to the north of, and on the same side as, the appeal property. Other residential vehicle crossovers of the footway are present in various locations around and opposite the property.

6. The proposed crossover would be adjacent to the section of the carriageway where parking is prohibited. The proposed hardstanding area would be situated within the front garden of the appeal property, although no details of this area have been provided. The front garden slopes down from the road. As a result of the width of the garden and this slope, I am not satisfied that sufficient space would be available to provide an appropriate and useable vehicle turning space. Use of the crossover would therefore require drivers to either reverse on or off the highway.
7. In the area of the proposed cross over, southbound drivers on Greenford Road have a number of distractions, which I have already identified. In addition, they are required to move towards the edge of the carriageway to pass the central refuge after passing parked vehicles. The introduction of a further crossover here would unacceptably increase the risk of traffic, cyclist and pedestrian conflict to the detriment of highway safety and in conflict with the NPPF.
8. I recognise that the proposed crossover would be of great benefit to the occupiers of the appeal property and improve their family circumstances. This does however have to be weighed against the adverse impact of the crossover on highway safety. I also recognise that the London Plan suggests that a more flexible approach to off-street parking may be acceptable in some areas and that on-street parking has recently increased in the vicinity of the appeal property. These matters would not however outweigh the adverse impact on highway safety that I have identified.
9. In addition to other crossovers near to the appeal property, my attention has been drawn to a recently permitted crossover at 406 Greenford Road, although its purpose appears to be different to the crossover which is the subject of this appeal. I am not aware of the circumstances surrounding this permission. In any event however, each case should be treated on its own merits, and I do not consider that the presence of this crossover adds weight in favour of allowing the appeal.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on highway safety and that it would thus conflict with the NPPF.

Conclusion

11. Having taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision, and my conclusion is based on the evidence before me in terms of policy as a whole. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Roscoe

INSPECTOR