
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3373974

276 North Hyde Lane, Southall, Hounslow UB2 5TG

- 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 Gurbachan Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application reference is P/2025/1650.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a vehicle access and dropped kerb to the front of the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of a vehicle access and dropped kerb to the front of the existing property at 276 North Hyde Lane, Southall, Hounslow UB2 5TG in accordance with the terms of the application reference P/2025/1650 subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matter

2. The appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading. The Council has, however, additionally referred to the installation of an electric vehicle charging point and the replacement of the existing front brick boundary wall. From my inspection of the plans, I consider that the Council's description more fully reflects the development sought. I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development firstly, on the character and appearance of the local area; and secondly, on highway safety for users of North Hyde Lane, including pedestrians.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling that faces North Hyde Lane, which is a classified road within a predominantly residential area. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a forecourt, footway and a grass verge along which there are road-side trees. Together, these features contribute positively to the sense of space and verdant character of the local street scene.
5. The proposal includes a new vehicle crossover to connect the forecourt of No 276 with the main carriageway of North Hyde Lane. It would replace a section of the wide grass verge with a permeable hard surface and introduce a dropped kerb.

6. The grass verge at this location exceeds 5 metres in width, which is not disputed by the appellant. In those circumstances, the Council's Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (SPD) states that there is a presumption against the construction of crossovers. However, the SPD also notes that such proposals will be assessed on their individual merits, which I have done in this instance.
7. From what I saw, several properties on either of the site have dropped kerbs and driveways that cross sections of the wide grass verge, in a similar manner to the proposal. These accesses occur at short intervals and already regularly punctuate the verge. As a result, the frontage of No 276 does not form part of a continuous or intact stretch of greenery, but instead sits within a streetscape where the grass verge is subdivided by hard surfaces associated with other driveways. While the Council notes that these existing crossovers do not post-date the adoption of the SPD, they remain prominent and established features of the street scene. In this context, the introduction of an additional crossover would not significantly erode the verdant character of the area, nor would it appear visually disruptive within the grass verge. As such, it would not be an uncharacteristic addition.
8. The Council raises no objection to the proposed replacement front boundary wall or to the new electric vehicle charging point. From the submitted evidence, I have no reason to disagree with that view.
9. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause significant harm the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 or SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) or the guidance within the Council's SPD. Together, these policies and guidance aim to ensure that developments maintain or enhance local character.

Highway safety

10. The forecourt of No 276 is relatively limited in size, and vehicles would be likely to enter and leave the site by reversing onto or from North Hyde Lane. Even so, drivers would still have a reasonable view of oncoming traffic and pedestrians in both directions, having regard to the combined width of the footway and verge. Moreover, road users approaching the site should have ample time to anticipate a vehicle slowing to turn into or emerging from the site and respond accordingly.
11. The replacement front boundary wall would be of low height, allowing good visibility between drivers and pedestrians. Although a roadside tree within the grass verge would be close to the new crossover, its slender trunk and position would ensure that it would not materially obstruct sightlines for drivers exiting the site. The otherwise open nature of the grass verge and the low boundary treatment at the front of No 276 would ensure adequate inter-visibility of drivers and footway users.
12. Vehicles entering or leaving the forecourt may temporarily obstruct the footway. However, such manoeuvres would be infrequent, brief and undertaken at low speeds. Given the reasonable levels of visibility available, I am satisfied that pedestrian safety would not be compromised. The presence of multiple existing crossovers along this section of North Hyde Lane also means that most footway users would be alert to the possibility of vehicles entering and exiting the site.
13. For a single crossover, the SPD specifies a maximum dropped kerb width of 3.6 metres. As the new crossover would exceed this threshold, it would not comply with this element of the guidance. It would also conflict with LP Policy EC2, which seeks consistency with the Council's adopted policy on vehicle crossovers.

However, the proposal would not, in this case, result in demonstrable harm to highway or pedestrian safety. Given this finding, and the SPD's acknowledgement that each case should be assessed on its own merits, a conflict with part of the SPD is insufficient reason to withhold planning permission.

14. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on highway safety, including pedestrians. It does not conflict with the aims of LP Policy EC2 to secure a sustainable local transport network. Whilst not meeting all technical requirements of the Council's SPD, the proposal would nonetheless be consistent with its overall purpose of ensuring that development does not give rise to unacceptable highway impacts.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. A condition securing the installation and retention of the electric vehicle charging facility shown on the submitted plans is also necessary, given its contribution to sustainability objectives.
16. The new vehicle crossover would be close to an existing roadside tree that is to be retained. A pre-commencement condition is therefore necessary to require a method statement to ensure this tree is safeguarded during construction. The appellant has agreed to this condition.

Conclusion

17. Overall, there are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Refs 2021/022-01, 2021/022-02, 2021/022-03, 2021/022-04, 2021/022-05 and the Electric Vehicle Charging Point Data Sheet entitled Solo 3 – Home.
- 3) No development shall take place until a method statement detailing measures to be taken during construction to protect the health of the nearest roadside tree on North Hyde Lane to the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed method statement shall be fully adhered to throughout the construction phase and until the development is complete.
- 4) The electric vehicle charging point hereby approved shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the vehicle crossover. Once installed, the charging point shall be retained and maintained in an operational condition for the lifetime of the development.