
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3246843
78 Hounslow Road, Feltham TW14 0AX

- 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 Ms S Parkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00631/78/P3, dated 29 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the formation of new crossover to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed crossover on the safety of road users.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies along the A244 Hounslow Road, a Primary Distributor road. Along the road, in the vicinity of the site, are predominantly residential dwellings, albeit that opposite is a hotel. I observed that the majority of properties had parking areas provided to the front, whether they be accessed via a dropped kerb or not. Whilst there was a regular and steady stream of traffic utilising the road, speeds were generally low and given that the road is straight at this location, drivers would have good visibility of traffic conditions ahead. Consequently, the likely vehicle manoeuvres of vehicles entering the site, associated with the creation of a vehicle crossover at this location, would not result in confusing or conflicting movements for drivers.
4. The Council highlight that visibility splays of 2.4 metres (m) x 43m, in both directions would be required given the sites location within a 30 miles per hour speed limit. The proposal contains no information in respect of vehicular visibility, and I noted that there were substantial street trees located within the footway which have the potential to limit the visibility of oncoming traffic for vehicles leaving the site. As a consequence, due to the lack of information, I am unable to find that adequate visibility would be available. I note that the appellant asserts that the trees do not interfere with neighbouring accesses, however this does not convince me that trees would not interfere with visibility at this location.

5. The Council also seeks 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian visibility splays. These have been shown on the submitted plans at the edge of the carriageway, rather than at the inner edge of the footway. Given the position of the access it is likely that any such visibility would involve land within the frontage of the neighbouring site. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that adequate visibility can be achieved in this regard.
6. The submitted details show the provision of parking for two vehicles to the front of the dwelling, with an area of lawn to the side. As such, whilst the appellant contends that there was previously room in the site to park cars and to turn, there is no such provision for the turning of vehicles within the site, to allow them to enter and leave the site in a forward gear, proposed within the scheme that is before me. The likely occurrence therefore of vehicles having to reverse out onto the road would lead to dangerous manoeuvres.
7. Accordingly, I find that there is insufficient evidence before me to allow me to find that the proposed crossover would not have a harmful effect on the safety of road users. Thus, the scheme conflicts with policy EC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030), insofar as it seeks to ensure that the local transport network improves health and well-being. The scheme would also conflict with the guidance of the London Borough of Hounslow – Residential Crossovers and Off-street Parking Policy document (October 2016).
8. I observed that the frontage to the property contained a number of mature shrubs that would likely limit further visibility when exiting the site. However, I find that this could be addressed through the use of appropriate planning condition and as such, find no harm in this respect.
9. I acknowledge that the appellant refers to the current necessity of having to find a parking space within nearby streets, that the existing rear access lane is not suitable and the improvement to convenience, as well as quality of life that the proposed scheme would bring. I have also had regard to the possibility of an electric car charging point being required in the future. However, even taken collectively, these matters are insufficient to outweigh the potential harm to highway safety that I have found above.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR