



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3346802

13 Wellesley Road, London, W4 4BS

- 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 Benjamin Rogers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Reference is P/2024/0936.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a vehicle access and installation of electric vehicle charger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling fronting the busy A3000. The road has parking limitations and weekday permit holder restrictions apply to spaces in front of the dwelling. The proposal is as described above. The Appellant sets out cogent reasons why this would be beneficial and should be allowed. The Council is concerned over the points set out as the main issue above.
 4. In October 2016 the Council produced a detailed document of relevance: Residential Crossover and Off-Street Parking Policy (PP) which sets out requirements for these matters.
 5. Regrettably the, to my mind generally reasonable, requirements of the PP would simply not be met by this proposal. Firstly, the scheme before me would fail to offer sufficient compliant depth for parking in the front garden for parking perpendicular to the road. This would risk vehicular over-hang to the footway. Secondly, the requisite visibility splays, also set out for safety reasons, are not guaranteed to be achievable as third-party land would be involved.
 6. I would support the Council's stance that relaxation would not be appropriate here due to the proximity of a neighbouring crossover, the modest width of footway, and the busy nature of this highway corridor.
 7. Policy EC2 of the Council's Local Plan seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure that crossovers are suitably considered via adopted parking policy and that these and associated development would not prejudice highway and pedestrian safety. I conclude the appeal scheme would conflict with these development plan policies and the related over-arching objective of the October 2016 PP
-

document cited above. In this case the public harm from the proposal would clearly outweigh any benefits to the Appellant and the household.

Other matters

8. I do sympathise with the Appellant's wish to provide direct access for a disabled close relative and I can understand the desire to achieve an independent EV charging point. Unfortunately, in a busy, and relatively high density, urban area it is not always possible to secure on site parking and best use has to be made of road side options which at least in this instance may be open to the Appellant.
9. I do appreciate that there a number of vehicular access points and frontage parking along this stretch of road. However, I have no evidence that these were allowed post the 2016 adoption of the PP or, if they were, would fail to meet its standards. In any event I have to consider this case on its own merits; the question of precedent does not arise.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. I noted an EV charging point via the lamppost adjoining the proposed driveway and EV parking bay partly in front of the Appellant's proposed parking space. This could provide a convenient EV point for the Appellant and its existence could be said to be an important community asset which may be missed and could be concerning if the appeal scheme were to progress and the EV facility removed. I appreciate that the Appellant could be responsible for moving this lamp column, with the space being repositioned, but this is a factor which is not addressed by the Appellant and, whilst not a determinant, adds to my concerns.
12. Finally, the appeal property falls within the Wellesley Road Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Front boundary treatment would be a key consideration on this aesthetic related issue. I do not have elevations to show intended height or design of this for the appeal site and this also adds to my concerns.

Overall conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on highway and pedestrian safety and traffic flow. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR