
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2019 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3226582

148 Wellington Road South, Hounslow, TW4 5JH

- 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 Manish Bhagat against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01181/148/P4, dated 19 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is the creation of new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for consideration is the effect of the use of the proposed access on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers using Wellington Road South (A3063).

Reasons for the recommendation

4. The proposal involves the creation of a vehicular crossover to facilitate access to and from the A3063 at No.148 Wellington Road South. The appeal site has a paved forecourt, on which is proposed to accommodate 2 parking spaces. The property also has shared access to the rear of the building with the adjoining No.150, which leads to garages. Evidently, the designated garage for the appeal property is no longer used for this purpose and as such, additional parking provision is required.
5. The A3063 is a single lane carriageway and links the A315 to the north with the A314 to the south. During the site visit, which was undertaken in the early afternoon, I noted the heavy volume of traffic even outside of the morning and afternoon rush hours.
6. The Council has drawn my attention to the Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (PP) document, which informs the standards expected of such developments. Although the number of vehicular movements using the

new crossover would be relatively modest, the appeal scheme would result in motorists slowing down and either turning into or out of a very busy road.

7. The appeal statement includes plans showing how the two parking spaces would be accommodated. The plans show that there would be insufficient space to turn a vehicle in the forecourt, meaning at least one movement accessing or egressing would be in reverse. The likely scenario to achieve this is described in the appeal statement which indicates the users of the access would reverse into the parking area after pulling to the side of the road. Such a manoeuvre would mean either pulling onto the adjacent footways of the A3063 or stopping on the road. If this were to be undertaken from the opposite side of the carriageway it would be even more dangerous, crossing the on-coming traffic after waiting in traffic or on the footway for an opportune time to manoeuvre. While I would concur with the appellant's statement that this is not a policy requirement to enter and exit in a forward movement, this suggested arrangement would pose an obvious and significant risk to pedestrians and highway safety for road users and be contrary to guidance within PP which requires road users to accomplish this in a single movement.
8. Furthermore, while the statement of case argues there is an excellent standard of vision along Wellington Road South, there are no visibility splays on the submitted plans demonstrating visibility from the proposed access. A wall exists to the northern boundary, and although the appeal statement points out that a section of fence atop the wall has been removed to improve visibility, there is no evidence to suggest this would meet the criteria detailed in the PP document. This has the potential to cause drivers exiting the parking area to move closer than would normally be expected to the road to gain line of sight, and while drivers using the road should be aware of hazards, the lack of visibility would increase the risk of collision unnecessarily. Vehicles emerging from the site waiting on the footway for a gap in the traffic may also obstruct pedestrians or cyclists.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to several other vehicular crossovers and driveways on residential properties in the vicinity. Indeed, I did note numerous examples during the site visit along the road. I would also agree with the benefits of providing off-street parking in such a congested area weighing into the planning balance. Nonetheless, the existence of other driveways elsewhere and benefits to the appellant do not negate or alter the material harm arising from the proposed scheme.
10. The statement of case also suggests methods to ensure acceptability of the proposal, secured via conditions, such as limiting the forecourt to being used by one vehicle and widening the proposed opening in the front wall. However, while sympathising with the appellant in their desire to create off-street parking for safety and convenience, I am unconvinced based on the evidence before me that the proposal could be implemented even with these amendments while simultaneously maintaining the requisite level of safety of pedestrians and road users, including cyclists. As such, the benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. I would therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to pedestrian and highway safety contrary to Policy EC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP) which seeks to develop a sustainable local transport network

including, amongst other things, requiring that vehicle crossover proposals are consistent with the Council's adopted PP guidance.

Recommendation

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

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR