



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by S Harley BSc(Hons) M.Phil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3285302

131 Mandeville Road, Northolt, UB5 4LY

- 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 Javaid Ravi against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 214289HH, dated 17 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2021.
 - The development proposed as described on the decision notice is formation of vehicle crossover and alteration to front of property involving hard and soft landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner heading above I have used the description of development set out on the planning decision notice as this more succinctly describes the proposed development.
3. The reason for refusal of the planning application refers to Policy T3 of the London Plan 2021 (the LP). However, that appears to relate to transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding and appears not to relate directly to the proposal before me.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Mandeville Road, the A312, is one of the main distributor roads in the Borough and carries a substantial proportion of commercial, commuter and other traffic. No 131, the appeal site, is a semi-detached house in a row of similar houses. The houses have front gardens and are separated from the carriageway by a footpath and grass verge. The front garden of the appeal site is some 8m deep and some 7.5m wide.
6. The boundary wall would be removed and a block paved hard standing some 8m deep by 6.5m wide with a soakaway would be created to enable parking to take place. A vehicle crossover some 2.4m wide is proposed. A planting strip about 1m wide would be retained to one side.
7. The hard standing would fall short of the 10m x 8m considered necessary by the Council's Transport Services to ensure a vehicle can enter the site, manoeuvre within it to turn around, and exit in forward gear. No plans showing

the way in which a vehicle can turn within the site have been provided, and, notwithstanding the view expressed by the appellant, I consider it improbable that there would be sufficient space available for most vehicles to enter and exit using forward gear. I would remain of this view even if the planting strip were to be omitted and that area were to be incorporated into the hard standing. Consequently, I consider it to be highly likely that the use of the proposed new vehicular access would result in vehicles reversing onto and/or off the road.

8. I noted at my site visit, carried out in the late morning of a typical weekday, that the road was busy with a near constant flow of traffic. On the appeal side of the road there is a dedicated bus lane so there are two lanes of traffic that can move towards the A40 as well as a lane of traffic opposite moving away from the A40, albeit all subject to a 20mph speed limit. Consequently entering and exiting the proposed parking space would require a minimum of manoeuvring across/into two lanes of traffic and, across/into three lanes if turning right out of the appeal site. Visibility is also partially impeded by a street trees in the grass verge. Taking all this into account either pulling into the side of the road and reversing, albeit for a short distance, into the site, or reversing onto the carriageway, would represent a significant hazard and increase road danger for road users.
9. I acknowledge that the removal of the boundary wall would enable intervisibility between emerging vehicles and users of the footpath and that no parking is allowed on the road during the day. However, this does not lead me to conclude that the use of the proposed parking space would be acceptable in highway safety terms.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to highway safety contrary to Policy T4 of the London Plan 2021 and those principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure there is no increase in road danger.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to a number of other vehicle crossing points in the area around the appeal site which I saw during my site visit. I also acknowledge that no evidence has been provided in respect of accidents locally. However, I have not been provided with full details of the circumstances and policies that applied at the time that any permissions were granted for these other crossovers. As such, I only give this matter limited weight and it does not outweigh the harm to highway safety that adding further turning movements would create.
12. Elsewhere in the Borough a colleague Inspector allowed a vehicular crossover appeal Ref APP/A5270/D/21/3272884. However, from what I have seen, that case was different in that there is only a single flow of traffic in each direction and I do not consider it to be a precedent for the appeal before me.
13. The appellant indicates the boundary wall is very damaged, weathered, and crumbling away thus it is dangerous and is an eyesore. However, even if this is the case, there are other remedies available which would not have the same impact on highway safety.

14. Planning permission was granted for a double garage Ref 12924. Whilst this might be a little less convenient it does mean that the site already has the option of on-site parking.
15. None of these matters lead me to any different conclusion in respect of this appeal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Harley

INSPECTOR