
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15TH September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3296598
37 St Paul's Close, Hounslow TW3 3DE

- 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 R Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00989/37/P1, dated 20 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a new crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of a new crossover at 37 St Paul's Close, Hounslow TW3 3DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00989/37/P1, dated 20 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 01A.
 - 3) Notwithstanding condition 2 no development shall take place until details of alterations to the boundary wall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the safety of vehicles and their occupants, and pedestrians.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to this 2 storey semi-detached house located towards the end of this residential cul-de-sac. Every other property within this section of St Paul's Close benefits from a dropped kerb and parking within the frontage of the houses. The submitted documents indicate that the appeal property has a garage within the rear of its plot, with access around the corner within St Paul's Close. However, the submitted documents also indicates that the appellant

refers to a dispute about access to that garage, although I do not have full details of this matter.

4. The proposal would result in the loss of a short section of on-street parking as marked out within this Controlled Parking Zone. But, as the Council indicates, the loss would be of 1 space but the proposal would provide for 2 off-street spaces and so there would be a net gain in parking spaces, albeit that the 2 proposed would be private.
5. The property is situated within the end section of this quiet residential cul-de-sac where there are low walls which define some boundaries. I saw no pedestrian activity at my short site visit and based on the fact that the road is a cul-de-sac, I would expect there to be little flow of pedestrians and vehicles passing the front of the appeal site. Even so, the appellant indicates on the submitted drawings that the walls within his property would be altered to provide visibility splays; although I acknowledge that this would not involve alterations to the wall outside his ownership.
6. I consider that some account must be taken of the appellant's stated problem with using the garage for parking. In addition, the location of the proposal means that I envisage little or no effect on the safety of pedestrians and vehicles here as visibility is generally good and passing people and cars are likely to be very few in number. I judge that any effect would not be unreasonable. Therefore, I see no conflict with Local Plan Policy EC2 in this respect.
7. In relation to conditions, the Council has suggested standard ones relating to the commencement of development and identification of the approved plans. The appellant indicates that a condition could be imposed so that the walls within his property are altered to provide suitable visibility and I shall include such a condition.

Conclusions

8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would have no unacceptable effects on highway safety. The property is within the St Paul's Hounslow West Conservation Area (although it is referred to by an alternative name in some documentation). The Council do not allege any unacceptable effects on the Conservation Area and I find no reason to conclude otherwise. As a consequence the appeal is allowed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR