



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3343184

282 Station Road, Hayes, Hillingdon, UB3 4AW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ranjit Atwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 21313/APP/2023/3578, dated 11 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Installation of Vehicular Crossover to Front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a mid-terraced dwelling. The area to the front of the dwelling is currently hardsurfaced, with a low brick wall and pedestrian gate along the front boundary of the site. The appeal proposal is for a vehicular crossover.
4. Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) states among other things that development proposals should not increase road danger. Policies DMT 2 and DMT 5 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP) require, amongst other things, development proposals to ensure that safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards, and that they do not contribute to the deterioration of safety of all road users and residents, including pedestrians.
5. The Council also refer in their officer report to their Domestic Vehicle Crossover Policy (August 2022), produced by Highway Services. This policy does not form part of the statutory development plan nor does it appear to be an adopted supplementary planning document. Notwithstanding this, the document sets out the Council's standards for crossovers and states, amongst other things, that 'new cross overs are not permitted within 10 metres of a bus stop flag (where there is no cage) or within bus stop cage markings to ensure that accessibility and safety for bus passengers are not affected. In the case of the

appeal proposal, the crossover is just outside of the bus cage markings. It is however, important to assess the proposal on its merits.

6. Station Road is a straight road, subject to a 30mph speed limit. There are pavements on both sides of the road. At the time of my site visit the road was busy, with a regular flow of traffic in both directions. The proposed crossover would result in the loss of an on-street parking space immediately to the front of the appeal property.
7. The proposed crossover would provide access to a single parking space within the front garden area of the appeal property. The existing front boundary would be removed in part, with the remainder of it replaced by a 0.6m high fence and pedestrian gate. Cars entering and egressing the frontage of the dwelling would either have to reverse out onto the highway or stop and reverse back into the site from Station Road.
8. The use of the crossover would be unlikely to interfere with pedestrians waiting at the bus stop given the position of the bus flag several metres to the west. The proposed crossover falls outside of the bus cage road markings although cars using the crossover would be likely to enter the markings. Whilst the retained front boundary of the appeal site would be lowered to a height of 0.6m to provide visibility on either side of the crossover, visibility for drivers, particularly when egressing the parking space, would be restricted by the high hedging along the front boundary of 284 Station Road. This could lead to conflict with buses pulling away from the bus stop and danger to pedestrians using the adjacent pavement as well as other road users travelling at a steady speed along Station Road.
9. Furthermore, parked vehicles to the east of the proposed crossover would also impede visibility of other road users. The appeal site is also opposite the junction between Station Road and Bushey Road which adds to the range of vehicular movements in the vicinity of the site and increased potential for conflict and danger and inconvenience to other users of the highway.
10. Having regard to all of the above considerations, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on pedestrian and highway safety. Thus, it would fail to comply with the highway safety objectives set out in Policy T4 of the LP and Policies DMT 2 and DMT 5 of the DMP.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to existing crossovers along Station Road, including several within bus cage markings. However, I am not aware of when they were constructed and whether they benefit from planning permission. In any event I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits. I have also been provided with an appeal decision in a different London Borough where a crossover was allowed within bus cage markings. However, I place little weight on this example as each proposal has to be assessed on its own merits. Furthermore, the circumstances appear rather different in that case as the Inspector clearly had regard to a planning permission granted on the site in 2001 for the existing garage and the formation of access onto classified road.
12. I note the location of the site in an area with a PTAL rating of 3 and the appellant's comments regarding family housing and car ownership. I am also aware of the appellant's original opposition to the adjacent bus stop and to

other schemes in the area that have reduced the amount of on-street parking along Station Road. The appellant has highlighted the parking pressures on Station Road and the difficulty parking close to the appeal property which has worsened recently due to additional waiting restrictions. I acknowledge the difficulties this causes to the appellant and in particular to his elderly mother who has health and mobility issues.

13. The proposal would also provide the opportunity to provide an electric vehicle charging point which is a positive aspect on the scheme.
14. However, even when considered in combination, these matters do not outweigh my concerns in relation to the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR