



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2023

by P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3322224

13 Bridge Road, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 2QW

- 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 Miss Rachel Kent against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 34523/APP/2022/3735, dated 22 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as drop kerb to provide cross vehicle crossover access to existing front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a drop kerb to provide cross vehicle crossover access to existing front garden at 13 Bridge Road, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 2QW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 34523/APP/2022/3735, dated 22 October 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan and scaled drawing of proposed development.

Preliminary Matter

2. Section E of the appeal form provides a different description of development to that in the application form, albeit it indicates that the description has not changed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have used the description of development provided in the application form in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

4. Bridge Road is a residential street fronted by two-storey dwellings set back from the pavement edge by frontages of similar lengths. There are on-street parking bays along the route, while a number of the property frontages feature dropped-kerb access and hardstanding to facilitate off-street parking.

5. 13 Bridge Road (No 13) is an end-of-terrace that has been subdivided into two flats and features a bay window to its front elevation. The appeal site comprises the ground floor flat at No 13 and the area to the front of the property.
6. Policy DMT6 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP) states that development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1. This table sets out that the minimum dimensions of a standard car parking bay are 2.4m x 4.8m. However, the policy allows for a variation of these requirements, when this would not lead to a deleterious impact on on-street parking provision, congestion or local amenity. Although not included in the Council’s reason for refusal, the officer’s report references Policy DMT2 of the DMP, which seeks to ensure a safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network.
7. Bearing in mind the bay window, the depth of the frontage area at the appeal site is below 4.8m. Consequently, if an average-sized vehicle were to park in the property’s frontage, it would be highly likely to overhang the public footway.
8. However, frontage parking is prevalent in the street and in my site visit I observed several vehicles overhanging the footpath. The dimensions of many of the existing driveways nearby appear to be similar to the appeal proposal. Although the proposal would likely result in an additional vehicle overhanging the footpath, it would not be so harmful in the context of the parking arrangements present on other properties across the street. Therefore, the effect of the appeal proposal on pedestrian safety would be unlikely to be any different to the existing situation of nearby properties using the area to the front of the dwellings for car parking.
9. The proposal would result in the loss of an on-street parking space in front of the site and, as such, it would be likely to reduce kerbside parking obstructing the pavement. An off-street space would be created, so the proposal would be unlikely to worsen the current difficulties with parking. In addition, as Bridge Road is narrow, the removal of this space would improve congestion and local amenity.
10. My attention is drawn to a previous scheme dismissed at appeal for a parking space within the property’s driveway. However, I have not been provided with a copy of this appeal decision, so I cannot be certain of the detailed circumstances that led the Inspector to their conclusion. It also pre-dates the current development plan. In any event, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the evidence before me and its individual planning merits.
11. In conclusion, the proposal would not be harmful to highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal would accord with Policies DMT6 and DMT2 of the DMP, which support safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway and development that would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity.

Other Matters

12. I note a third-party representation which draws my attention to the paths on the sides of the garden. These paths would remain in place following

development, so the front path to 13A Bridge Road would not change as a result of the proposal.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard commencement condition, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans, to provide certainty.
14. The Council is satisfied that the proposal would not be detrimental to living conditions, character and appearance of the area, trees or flooding. I have not been provided with any conditions to address any matters in this regard, however on the evidence before me I am satisfied that such conditions would not be necessary.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would comply with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. As such, the appeal should succeed.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR