



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3373574

31 Mandeville Road, Northolt, UB5 5HF.

- 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 Zivio Mascarenhas against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref is 251795HH.
 - The development proposed is formation of vehicular access and creation of area of hardstanding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for formation of vehicular access and creation of area of hardstanding at 31 Mandeville Road, Northolt, UB5 5HF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 251795HH, and Plans Nos H-0263-02 V1 and H-0263-05 V1, dated 30 April 2025, subject to the condition that the development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Main Issue

2. The sole main issue is the effect the proposed vehicular access would have on road safety.

Reasons

3. Mandeville Road is very busy, and the situation in the vicinity of No 31 is complicated by the entrance to the filling station opposite and the nearby Eastcote Road junction. This is compounded by the presence of a signalised pedestrian crossing, with its zig-zag warning markings extending across the frontage of the appeal property as well as that of its immediate neighbour, No 33, on the corner plot at Eastcote Lane.
4. No 33, already enjoys a vehicle access and crossover, as does No 29, just beyond the zig-zag markings. It is understandable that the Appellant seeks to improve the access to his property in a similar manner to that of his neighbours, citing personal benefit and his human right to the enjoyment of his family home. However, road safety is the paramount consideration in this fresh appraisal of the proposal, even where there seems to be a degree of inconsistency between the present situation and the refusal of the application. It is primarily on the basis of road safety that I consider this appeal.
5. There are a great many frontage vehicle accesses along this length of Mandeville Road, including some which conflict with pedestrian crossings and their kerbside zig-zag warning lines. On a clear section of road with no private entrances, it would

be crucial to avoid any footway crossovers conflicting with traffic approaching or departing from a pedestrian crossing, which it is the purpose of the zig-zag markings to prevent.

6. However, in the particularly busy and complex highway environment that already exists at the front of the appeal property, driver concentration on Mandeville Road is most likely to be focussed on the range of potential hazards, including the potential need to stop at the pedestrian crossing in particular.
7. It appears to me that one more vehicle access and crossover at No 31, in addition to that at No 33, across the zig-zag markings, and that at No 29 only just beyond them, would not significantly increase the overall level of risk to road safety in the vicinity of the appeal site.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would not unacceptably undermine the aims of the relevant development plan policy T4 of the London Plan to protect road safety.
9. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed, subject only to the standard time limit for commencement and compliance with the submitted plans.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR