



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3241124

63 Sutton Lane, Hounslow, Middlesex TW3 4LA

- 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 Tyrone Singh against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 01095/63/P1, dated 1 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as creation of vehicular access and hardstanding to the front of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the creation of vehicular access and hardstanding to the front of the house at 63 Sutton Lane, Hounslow, Middlesex TW3 4LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01095/63/P1, dated 1 August 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved unnumbered plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan, and Proposed plan.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of development above is taken from the Council's decision notice and Part E of the appeal form, in the interest of clarity.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene; and highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons for Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. Sutton Lane is an urban thoroughfare bounded mostly by traditional semi-detached two storey dwellings. Between the appeal property and the railway line to the south lies a cemetery, and opposite the appeal property lies a

- primary school. The road is wide and the trees and verges along it give it a pleasant character, softening the impact of development along it.
6. The appeal property itself is located centrally within a 5-dwelling terrace. The terrace is set back from the road, behind a pavement and grass verge. Like No's 61 and 59, the appeal property has hardstanding to the front. No 61 has a dropped kerb, as does No 65, although this property has no hardstanding to the front, and this is used for a pedestrian crossing.
 7. Whilst the grass verge contributes to the pleasant, open character of the street, there are numerous dropped kerbs and crossovers between stretches of verge along the road which are also characteristic. Other than No 61, granted in 2013, the planning history of the dropped kerbs and crossovers are not before me. Nevertheless, they are an established part of the street scene.
 8. The Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Crossovers and Off-street Parking Policy' (2016) (SPD), refers to the need to retain and protect grass verges and green spaces, amongst other matters. It is acknowledged that whilst the proposed development would result in a loss of part of the grass verge between the highway and the pavement to the front of No 63, the reduction in length of the verge would be small in this location. The impact of this on the setting of the terrace of which the host property forms part and the wider impact on the street scene would be similar to that associated with similar development nearby. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would be unlikely to be discernible given these matters.
 9. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene. There is no conflict therefore with Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One (LP) Policies CC1, CC2, SC7 and EC2 which collectively seek to retain, promote and support high quality urban design and the natural environment, and secure development that sensitively responds to an area's character. Moreover, there would be no conflict with the character aims of the SPD.

Highway and Pedestrian Safety

10. Sutton Lane is a lengthy residential road served by a number of bus services and stops. Vehicles exiting the parking areas to the front of dwellings are a characteristic of the area, and there are also some on road parking spaces within the vicinity of the appeal site in addition to parking restrictions opposite the site, where there is a primary school. In addition, a central pedestrian island or pedestrian refuge sits close by.
11. The depth of the hardstanding is similar to that of nearby hardstandings within the terrace, where I observed that parked vehicles were not overhanging the pavement when parked. I have no evidence before me to indicate that a vehicle parked upon the appeal site would need to overhang the pavement either.
12. I do however acknowledge that there is insufficient space to the front of the property to allow vehicles to turn and exit the property in a forward gear. This could result in vehicles reversing across the pavement, which may be busy with pedestrians, including school children at certain times of the day, and into the road, which may also be busy with cyclists, buses and cars.

13. However, there is a high probability that both pedestrians and other road users are aware of such movements along this stretch of the road. There is suitable visibility at the access to the parking area such that other highway users including pedestrians and school children, including those using the nearby refuge, would be able to see vehicles exiting the appeal site and drivers of vehicles using the access would be able to see other road users.
14. Furthermore, given the local highway conditions it is likely that the speed of traffic in this area is low, particularly at busy times of day such as those associated with the school's start and finish times. Vehicles entering and leaving the parking area would be unlikely to adversely affect the flow of traffic in the highway or result in conflict with other road users given these matters, and the likely low number of vehicle movements associated with the parking area.
15. Whilst the proposed access would be nearby the Harte Road junction, there is no reason on the basis of the evidence before me to demonstrate why this would lead to potential conflict with drivers of vehicles associated with the appeal site, as visibility on this corner is high and the speed of any traffic exiting from Harte Road would be likely to be low.
16. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not result in harm to highway or pedestrian safety. The proposal therefore accords with the highway safety and quality design objectives of LP Policies CC1, CC2 and EC2. It also complies with the highway safety aims of the SPD. Moreover, a safe and suitable access to the site would be provided in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Conditions

17. The Council has suggested a number of conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. These relate to the start date of development and compliance with the application plans. In the interest of clarity, I consider these to be necessary. A condition is also suggested requiring materials to match those used in the existing building. Given the nature of the proposal, I do not consider that this is necessary.

Recommendation

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

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, with the suggested conditions.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR