
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368002

71 Hercies Road, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 9LU

- 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. T Cunningham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 13487/APP/2024/3077.
 - The development proposed is to widen the existing vehicle access crossover, to provide a safer and more efficient access for vehicles.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to widen the existing vehicle access crossover, to provide a safer and more efficient access for vehicles, at 71 Hercies Road, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 9LU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13487/APP/2024/3077, 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 approved plans: LP-01-2024, BP-01-2024 and T1150-001 ; and
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be constructed with a minimal crossfall gradient and surfaced with a suitable material that matches or complements the connecting footway surface.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs has been made by the appellant and is the subject of a separate decision.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Hercies Road is a residential street characterised by properties set back from the pavement with relatively large front gardens and driveways. Kerbs have been dropped and vehicle crossovers are present at the majority of the properties in the vicinity of the appeal property.
6. The appeal property is an end of terrace which already features a dropped kerb and vehicle crossover which allows access to a parking area at the front of both the appeal property and its neighbour. The proposal seeks to widen the crossover to better align with the vehicle access at the property.
7. The London Borough of Hillingdon Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy (June 2022) sets a maximum width for domestic vehicle crossovers at 5.0 metres. In this case, the width of the crossover would be increased from circa 5.3 metres to 8 metres with transition kerbs to each side.
8. There is good visibility along the road and pavement on this section of Hercies Road, with double yellow lines preventing on-street parking. The pavement outside the appeal property is wide and open, allowing clear views of the pavement and highway. I also note from the appellant's evidence that records show no recent history of pedestrian safety issues along Hercies Road.
9. The Council have concerns that the increase in time it would take for pedestrians or cyclists to cross the widened crossover would increase the risk of a collision and that left-in drivers would be able to cross the footway at greater speeds due to the increased turning radii. However, there is no substantiated evidence that the widening would result in greater driving speed and the few additional seconds spent on the crossover by pedestrians and cyclists would not result in a measurable increase in risk given a crossover is already in place, with good visibility.
10. Whilst the Council attributes vehicles overrunning the kerb to inadequate driving, the widening would allow easier access to the property and inevitably reduce the risk of mounting the kerb which could easily occur in the current situation. Given that vehicle crossovers are such a common feature along the road and the widening of the crossover would allow better access to the appeal property I cannot see that an unacceptable conflict with pedestrians or cyclists would occur.
11. The Council's view that the appellant intends to demolish the small front boundary wall at the appeal property which could encourage drivers to enter the driveway at a higher speed is unsubstantiated and these works do not form part of the proposed development.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be acceptable in highway and pedestrian safety terms. As a result, it would comply with policy DMT 2, DMT 5, DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and policy T4 of The London Plan (2021) which seek to ensure a safe highway and safe and accessible pedestrian network. Whilst the proposed development exceeds the width limit set for extending vehicle crossovers in the Hillingdon Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy (June 2022) I am satisfied that no harm to highway safety will occur.

Other Matters

13. Representations were made to the effect that the appellant's human rights under Article 6, Article 8 and Article 11 as set out in the Human Rights Act 1998, would be violated if the appeal is dismissed. Since I have decided to allow the appeal and grant full planning permission for the proposed development, there will be no interference with the appellant's human rights. I note the Councils' view that the existing crossover has been in place for some time and in their view widening is not necessary on safety grounds. However, I have found no harm would occur to the public as a result of the proposed development.
14. There is a street lighting column within the verge, located in close proximity to the existing crossover and entrance to the appeal property. The council are of the view that the column would need to be moved to eliminate any risk of it being hit by vehicles using the proposed widened crossover. However, whilst vehicles could come closer to the lighting column, it is located to the side of the entranceway in front of a boundary wall and I consider the collision risk would be low.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. Where necessary, and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have altered the conditions to better reflect the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
16. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. Drawing no. CO-02-2024 shows the proposed crossover, however, there appear to be inconsistencies within the labelling and key of the drawing. As such, I cannot be satisfied with the development as shown. Notwithstanding, I am satisfied that drawing no. T1150-001, prepared by Apex Strategies and submitted during the original application, accurately reflects the existing and proposed crossover. Therefore, I have disregarded CO-02-2024 and conditioned T1150-001.
17. I have also included a condition to minimise crossfall gradient and ensure suitable materials are used to ensure the crossover is safe and suitable for all users and is in keeping with the area.
18. Whilst the council have suggested a condition to ensure unobstructed sight lines above one metre are maintained on both side of the entrance to the appeal site, I do not consider this condition to be necessary as the entrance is set back from the pavement which is wide and open with good visibility of oncoming pedestrians and road users.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above, the proposal complies with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh this finding. Consequently, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Allen

INSPECTOR