



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3286886
382 London Road, Isleworth TW7 5AJ

- 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 Mrs Roopa Roddah against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00707/382/P5, dated 02 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 07 September 2021.
 - The proposed development is creation of a vehicle crossover to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on London Road, close to the junction with Wood Lane. The frontage of the appeal property is paved and relatively open. Both parties make reference to the paved area having been used for informal vehicle parking and although planning permission was granted in 1998 for a vehicle crossover a raised kerb is still in place at the front of the appeal property, indicating that this permission was not implemented.
5. The proposal would introduce a vehicle crossover at the front of the property to allow for the paved area to be formally used as a parking space. London Road is observed to be a busy road, subject to a 30 miles per hour speed limit. Bus routes operate along London Road and there is a cycle route and a single red line road marking to the section of road fronting the appeal site indicating a 'Red Route'.
6. The paved area is not of a sufficient size to allow vehicles to turn within the site. Vehicles would therefore either have to access or exit the site in reverse. There is a tall fence between the appeal property and the neighbouring

property (No. 380 London Road), which would, to some extent, limit visibility of the pavement and highway when exiting the site. It is noted that on this basis, the proposal would not accord with the Council's Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (October 2016) as it does not meet the requirements for pedestrian visibility splays of 2.4m x 2.4m.

7. The Council have provided collision data which indicates that there have been a number of minor road accidents within 40 metres of the appeal site in recent years, including one involving a vehicle entering or leaving a private drive or entrance. This collision evidence, the limited visibility and the busy nature of London Road indicate to me that there would be an increase in the likelihood of conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motorists from the use of the proposed vehicle crossover and it would result in an unacceptable impediment to the safe flow of traffic.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to many of the neighbouring properties on London Road, including the adjoining neighbours at No. 380 and No. 384, possessing dropped kerb accesses to frontage parking, which I also noted on my site visit. However, these properties are also likely to encounter similar issues in terms of safety and impeding the safe flow of traffic, and do not serve to demonstrate that further off-street parking would be acceptable. The proposal would only exacerbate the potential for vehicular conflict. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the double red line road marking outside No. 384. However, the Council's evidence indicates that the 'Red Route' has only recently been designated and the driveway at No. 384 pre-dates this.
9. For the reasons above, the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This would be contrary to Policy CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) (the 'Local Plan') which seek, amongst other things to promote good design. It would also be contrary to Policy EC2 of the Local Plan which seeks, amongst other things to ensure development demonstrates that adverse impacts on the transport network are avoided. The proposal is contrary to Policy T2 and T4 of the London Plan (adopted March 2021) which seek to prevent development that would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
10. The appeal site is in an area with a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 4 which indicates it has a 'good' level of access to public transport. Whilst the appellant argues that a parking space is a reasonable expectation and it would be unfair not to allow the proposal, Policy T6.1 of the London Plan sets out that residential properties in PTAL area of 4 require less than 1 parking space per dwelling. Whilst I understand that a parking space is desirable, the policy indicates that a parking space for a residential dwelling in this area is not

Other Matters

11. The appellant has made reference to their frustration with communication with the Council and to a change in the allocated Planning Officer during the planning application process. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant's frustration, this is not a material consideration which would weigh in support of the planning merits of the proposed development.
12. I have had regard to the appellant's indication that part of the reason for the vehicular cross-over is that whilst parked away from the property the current tenant's vehicle has been broken into by thieves. However, whilst this is clearly

an unfortunate turn of events, I have no evidence before me to suggest that this is anything other than an isolated incident or that vehicles parked on driveways in the area have not also been targeted. I therefore attach only very limited weight in support of the proposal to this matter, which would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR