



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3270010

61 Uxbridge Road, Feltham, TW13 5EQ

- 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 Muhammad Butt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01145/61/P3, dated 20 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Planning for crossover – Hounslow Highways require planning permission due to the classified road.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on a residential section of Uxbridge Road which is a classified road. The dwelling is well set back from Uxbridge Road and its deep frontage is mainly hardsurfaced and used for parking. The frontages of several other dwellings along this stretch of Uxbridge Road are also hardsurfaced although the majority are not accessed via a formal crossover. I also noted at my site visit that cars are parked along Uxbridge Road on marked out bays on the pavement.
4. Policy EC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP) seeks a more sustainable local travel network that maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and using public transport, reduces congestion, improves the public realm and improves health and well-being. Amongst other matters, it requires proposals for vehicle crossovers to be consistent with the council's adopted policy on vehicle crossovers.
5. The Council's Residential Crossovers and Off- Street Parking Policy (October 2016) ('residential crossover guidance') provides detailed guidance on the design of crossovers. Whilst not forming part of the statutory development plan, I consider that this document provides useful guidance on the acceptability of vehicular crossovers in the Borough.

6. The residential crossover guidance requires the provision of pedestrian visibility splays of 2.4m x 2.4m at the back of the footway and on both sides of the crossover. It also states that there should be no obstructions over 600mm high within this area. A small section of the visibility splay in both directions falls within land outside of the appellant's control although at present visibility is not impeded by the side boundaries which, whilst over 600mm in height, allow views across neighbouring land. The residential crossover guidance states that in these circumstances a relaxation to the above requirements may be considered, taking into account the amount of pedestrian activity along the footway and the width of the footway. The pavement is of considerable width and at my site visit, I observed that whilst there were pedestrians using the pavement, it was not heavily used. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that visibility would be adequate and that the safety of users of the pavement would not be prejudiced by the proposal in this regard.
7. There is a signal controlled pedestrian crossing on Uxbridge Road which is close to the frontage of the appeal site. The use of the proposed vehicular crossover would involve crossing the markings associated with the pedestrian crossing. The site is also broadly opposite the access to a service road which serves dwellings on the opposite site of Uxbridge Road.
8. I observed on site that whilst relatively straight, Uxbridge Road is subject to busy traffic even during quieter times of the day. Whilst vehicular movements associated with one dwelling would be limited, there is no space to turn within the site and vehicles would have to reverse in or out of the site over the crossover. I consider that such vehicular manoeuvres arising from the proposed crossover would have the potential to impede the free flow of traffic and to cause an unacceptable risk of collision particularly with vehicles pulling away from the pedestrian crossing. This leads me to conclude that the proposed crossover would be hazardous users of the highway. Moreover, the residential crossover guidance states that crossovers should not be within the zig zag markings of pedestrian crossings and the proposal clearly conflicts with the guidance in this regard.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that the frontage of the appeal property is already used for parking, this would not justify a formal crossover in this location. The appellant has also highlighted the crossovers that exist opposite the site at 46 and 50 Uxbridge Road. These crossovers are also within the zig zag markings of the pedestrian crossing. However, I have not been provided with any evidence as to how long these have been in existence or indeed, whether they benefit from planning permission. In any event, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety and would be contrary to both Policy EC2 of the Local Plan and the adopted Residential Crossovers and Off-street Parking Policy which together seek to ensure that road safety is not adversely affected by development proposals.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR