



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3362704

108 Wellington Road North, Hounslow TW4 7AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P. Dhir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/3004.
 - The development proposed is new dropped kerb to provide vehicle parking at the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Number 108 Wellington Road North (No 108) is located to the east side of the A3063, a classified single carriageway road. There are footways on both sides of the carriageway. The appeal property is within Public Transport Accessibility Level 4 zone meaning access to public transport is good. Opposite to No 108, on the north bound carriageway, is a bus stop.
5. The London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 (the Local Plan) Policy EC2(e) requires that: '*...proposals for vehicles crossovers be consistent with the council's adopted policy on vehicle crossovers.*' The Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (2016) sets out at paragraph 3.14 that: '*Crossovers are not permitted within 10 metres of a bus stop or within bus stop road markings to ensure that accessibility and safety for bus passengers is not affected.*'
6. Whilst I accept that it represented only a snapshot in time, at the time of my visit, which was school collection time, the A3063 appeared to be a busy road. Due to its proximity to the north bound bus stop, the proposal would create a significant adverse risk to both highway users and pedestrians, having a significant harmful effect on highway safety. This is due to conflicting and competing movements of road users and pedestrians, with specific emphasis on: busses; vehicles trying to

- overtake stopped busses; vehicles attempting to access and egress the proposed development; and pedestrians that are attempting to cross to either catch the bus or after alighting the bus.
7. Vehicles reversing into the parking space would require traffic on the carriageway to stop or wait while the manoeuvre is carried out. It would be likely that those vehicles may have to wait sometime due to pedestrians walking in front of the parking space access. Whilst that delay may not have a severe impact on the road network, the proposal would result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety and therefore the proposal would not accord with the provisions of paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework).
 8. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with Local Plan Policy EC2, and would fail to accord with the provisions of the Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy, which together seek to ensure that road and pedestrian safety is not adversely affected by development proposals. The proposal would also conflict with relevant paragraphs of the Framework, insofar as they seek to protect the highway network and promote sustainable transport and safe, healthy streets.
 9. Evidence has been submitted in support of the appeal which confirms that a family member at the appeal property has a number of health issues, including restricted mobility. That evidence sets out that the proposed crossover would assist in helping that family member in accessing the property. Therefore, I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in s149 of the Equalities Act 2010. The duty includes having regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, and advance equality of opportunity between those sharing relevant protected characteristics and those who do not. Age and Disability are relevant protected characteristics to which the PSED applies.
 10. These rights are engaged in reaching my recommendation and I have kept these interests at the forefront of my mind. However, they are qualified rights, and interference may be justified in the public interest. The concept of proportionality is key. I recognise that the use of the proposed crossover and parking may facilitate the involvement of persons with protected characteristics. However, the evidence is that the appellant has parking access to the rear of the property, and it has not been demonstrated that the appeal proposal is the only means which would provide assistance for the family member in being able to access the property. I am also mindful that personal circumstances and ownership of the land can change, but the effect of the development would be permanent.
 11. Thus, on the basis of the evidence before me, the PSED considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified. Following careful consideration of these particular matters I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing this appeal is proportionate and justified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR