
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3264938

81 Fern Lane, Hounslow, Middx TW5 0HH

- 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 Arshad Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00440/81/P4, dated 27 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a vehicle crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, which is balanced against any need for the proposal.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to this end-of-terrace house which is located within a mainly residential area of similar properties. The frontage of the property is hard-surfaced and provides parking for 2 cars.
4. The verge within Fern Lane, and along this section in particular, is wide and mainly grassed but also contains a number of trees along its length. Due to its width and the trees, the verge makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The verge is punctuated by a number of vehicle accesses, which lead to the individual houses on Fern Lane. The existing parking spaces at the appeal site take access from one such section and this also leads along the side of the property to a number of garages. The Council's normal practice is not to allow a second access to a residential property which already has one and this is contained within the 'Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (October 2016)' (RCOSPP). This indicates that this is, in part, so that features that contribute to the street-scene are not unduly affected.
6. The proposal would result in a section of the existing grass verge being hard-surfaced which would diminish its contribution to the street-scene. I fully accept that a number of existing accesses have been formed by similar arrangements but the Council's approach is clear in that it will normally allow

residents to form a vehicle access to their homes but will generally resist a second access due to the likely loss of features that have a positive effect on the street-scene. I consider that this would be the case here as the existing access enables cars to be parked within the frontage of the property.

7. The appellant states that the proposal would enable a household member who is registered disabled, to gain access to the property. He indicates that the existing drive requires an awkward manoeuvre to leave the property in reverse gear. I have taken account of the representations made by the appellant and the diagrams presented with the appeal. However, I note that the existing parking area is close to the front door of the house and would afford household members with close access to a car on the frontage. In respect of the manoeuvres involved, in the absence of technical submissions indicating vehicle tracking, I consider that such a manoeuvre would be quite normal and would not present any greater complexity than a driver would normally encounter. With regard to the fact that the existing access is shared by other properties, the presence of other vehicles would be readily apparent to a driver entering or leaving the appeal site. Added to this and taking account of the relatively small number of properties with access here, I consider that such an occurrence would be rare.

Conclusions

8. As a result of my consideration of the relevant matters, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the street-scene and that such harm is not outweighed by any other matters. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan Volume One and there are no matters which outweigh that conflict. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR