
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3272505

205 Lynhurst Crescent, Uxbridge UB10 9EJ

- 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 Suzanne Liddiard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76117/APP/2021/7, dated 31 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the installation of vehicular crossover and front driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a vehicular crossover and front driveway at 205 Lynhurst Crescent, Uxbridge UB10 9EJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 76117/APP/2021/7 dated 31 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan: 1213 A1 P02 Rev.A and shall thereafter be retained/maintained for as long as the development remains in existence.
 3. The vehicle crossover hereby approved shall not exceed a gradient of 1:60 and shall be surfaced with materials of an appropriate material to match or complement the connecting footway surface to allow ease of use by older and disabled people.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a former two storey semi-detached dwelling that has been converted to form two maisonettes, located on a relatively quiet suburban residential street towards the western end close to the head of the Crescent. It is of similar character and appearance to properties either side along the southern part of the street. The proposal seeks to construct an off-road parking

space or spaces to the front of the property with associated dropped kerb, following the removal of part of a dwarf brick wall and hedge.

4. The appeal site is located on an unclassified residential street that has no parking restrictions save for road hatching at the secondary entrance to Ryefield Primary School. At the time of my site visit, which was early evening when most residents would have been at home, I observed that the on-street parking spaces that were available were generally taken up presumably by residents. I also noted that a high majority of residential properties enjoy the benefit of off-street parking provision, which in turn reduces on-street provision due to the presence of drive entrances. It is possible that localised problems might occur at the start and close of the school day.
5. Although the submitted drawings fail to provide vehicular turning facilities within the site, given the character of the Crescent and the proposed removal of the hedgerow, I do not believe this would cause unacceptable pedestrian-vehicular conflict. Whilst the proposal would result in an additional access along the southern side of the Crescent, which would be in proximity to other access points alongside, vehicles on this side of the road would be slowing down considerably to negotiate the right-angled approach onto Floriston Avenue. I therefore consider that the addition of one access at this point would not significantly alter the nature of the traffic flows in this location.
6. The Council claim that it has carried out research that suggests that parking is at a premium partly as a result of the large number of maisonettes in the vicinity together with the large number of existing cross-overs to existing driveways here. The Council considers that two spaces would be lost. However, I have serious doubts about this and given the presence of the school access hatching and driveways to adjoining properties, I consider that the proposal would in all probability lead to the loss of just one on-street parking space. This in my view would be compensated by the provision of at least one if not two off-street spaces dependent on the size of vehicle that would be accommodated. I am also conscious that the proposed development would result in the opportunity to provide an electric car charging points closer to the host property at some point in the future.
7. I am not convinced that this proposal would contribute to the parking stress that the Council believes exist at this location. Rather, the proposal would result at the very least in the maintenance of the status quo in terms of parking numbers with the possibility of an additional space. Certainly, I do not consider that circumstances exist at this particular location that would invoke considerations outlined in paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies DMT1, DMT2 or DMT6 of the Council's Development Management Policies contained within the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two document of 2020. These policies seek to ensure that alterations to existing dwellings do not add to highway concerns and promote high quality design which improves the way that an area functions. Most specifically, the proposal would comply with the ambitions set out in Policy DMT6 (A)(i).

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition listing the approved plans to provide certainty. The Council's suggested condition in respect of maximum gradient and surfacing of the driveway is also attached as this secures highway safety and convenience.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters and representations received, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR