
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **D Marley BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3376069

39 Townson Avenue, Northolt UB5 6PW

- 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 S Lal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 253229FUL.
 - The development proposed is crossover and insertion of kerb dropdown to create parking access on to front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for crossover and insertion of kerb dropdown to create parking access on to front garden at 39 Townson Avenue, Northolt UB5 6PW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 253229FUL, 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: P3901; Location Plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the site address used in my decision from the decision notice, as this more accurately describes the site.
3. At my site visit, I observed the layout of the site differed from that set out on the existing site plan. Nevertheless, for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the scheme on the basis of the proposed plans before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

5. The existing dwelling has a single vehicular crossover and dropped kerb. The appeal site is some distance from adjoining junctions. Townson Avenue is a residential street of moderate width, with good visibility in both directions from the appeal site. At the time of my site visit, Townson Avenue was lightly trafficked with slow moving vehicles, most vehicles were parked on driveways, and a significant amount of street parking was available. Whilst only representing a point in time, there is not contrary evidence before me to suggest my experience was not

typical. A considerable number of nearby dwellings have driveways, with a variety of dropped kerbs and driveways of varied widths.

6. The proposed development would introduce a second dropped kerb and vehicular crossover at 39 Townson Avenue. Based on the plans before me I acknowledge that vehicles would likely be unable to enter and exit the proposed driveway in a forward gear. Nevertheless, this arrangement would be similar to many existing driveways along Townson Avenue.
7. Furthermore, whilst the refusal reason refers to the need for forward access and egress, this is not further substantiated in the officer report, nor is this required by the relevant section of the 'Highways Service – Vehicle Crossover Application Pack' (the 'Crossover Application Pack').
8. Given the number, arrangement and variety of crossovers along this section of Townson Avenue, both pedestrians and road users would be likely to be anticipating vehicles to reverse into, or out of, their driveways. As a result of the visibility along Townson Avenue, the width of the road, the distance to the nearest junctions, and the low volume and speed of traffic, I consider that sufficient warning would be available to pedestrians and road users that a vehicle was intending to enter or exit the driveway.
9. In addition, whilst I have not been provided with precise details as to the width of the proposed crossover, given the availability of on street parking, I do not consider that the proposed development would be likely to adversely impact the availability of parking in the vicinity. Equally, given the wide variety of crossover widths already present on the street, the proposed arrangement would not be likely to impede or otherwise deter pedestrians from using the footway.
10. As a result of the above matters, I therefore consider the proposed crossover and driveway arrangement would provide safe and suitable access to the site without risk to other road users or pedestrians.
11. I have had regard to the guidelines with regards the quantum of crossovers per dwelling set out in the Crossover Application Pack. The proposed development would conflict with these guidelines through the introduction of a second vehicular crossover for a single residential property. However, whilst the Council state that harm to highway safety would occur as a result of a second dropped kerb, no substantive evidence is before me as to why harm would result from such an arrangement. Given my observations above with regards the effect of the proposed development on highway safety, I therefore accord the conflict with the requirements of the Crossover Application Pack limited weight.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact to highway safety. The proposed development would accord with the relevant provisions of Policies T3 and T4 of the London Plan 2021. Amongst other matters, these policies require that walking routes should be safeguarded and that development proposals should not increase road danger.

Other Matters

13. Whilst reference has been made to the potential for the development to impact nearby tree roots, there is no substantive evidence before me with regards this matter. The effect of the proposed development on trees was additionally not a

matter identified in the decision notice or officer report. As such, this matter has not led me to an alternative conclusion with regards the appeal.

Conditions

14. The Council has recommended certain conditions in the event that the appeal is allowed. I have assessed the Council's suggested conditions with reference to the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance, and have made a number of consequential amendments.
15. Alongside the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
16. The Council has proposed a condition relating to the provision of visibility splays and a specific width for the proposed crossover. The identified distances for each are set out in the Crossover Application Pack. Nevertheless, I have concluded that the proposed development as shown on the submitted plans would not result in an unacceptable impact with regards to the safety of road users or pedestrians, and I have not been directed to a harm that would arise in the event the width of the crossover was greater than 2.4 metres. In light of the above and my findings on the evidence before me, I do not consider such a condition to be necessary.
17. Given the nature of the development, it would be unnecessary to require the external materials used in the driveway, crossover and brick wall to match those used on the existing building.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons, the proposed development would accord with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it, Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

D Marley

INSPECTOR