



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law**
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3361541

364 Victoria Road, Ruislip HA4 0ET

- 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 Mrs Rajal Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application ref. is 3415/APP/2024/3176.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey rear extension and the installation of a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. Planning permission is sought to construct a single-storey rear extension and install a dropped kerb, vehicle crossover, and hardstanding to the front garden. The proposed rear extension is identical to the rear extension approved on 11 October 2024 under application reference 3415/APP/2024/2437 and therefore there is no planning issue in relation to that element of the appeal. Consequently, the main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposed crossover and hardstanding on highway safety and the effect on the visual amenity and character of the area.

Reasons

Highway Safety

3. The appeal site is located on Victoria Road in Ruislip. It is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling located on the south-western side of the road. The appeal dwelling has a mainly soft landscaped front garden that is bounded by brick dwarf walls. The Victoria Road public footpath that adjoins the front boundary comprises a grass verge. The property has a garage at the bottom of the rear garden that fronts an access road to the rear, which leads off Bridgwater Road to the north. Some other properties have garages and parking spaces off the same access road.
4. The immediate locality is characterised by mainly terraced dwellings. A number of properties in the streetscene, including the adjoining properties at nos. 362 and 366 have hard-surfaced front gardens and vehicular crossovers leading off the highway.
5. Planning permission is sought to install a dropped kerb, vehicle crossover, and hardstanding to the front garden.

6. Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should not increase road danger. Policy DMT 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals will be required to meet the transport needs of the development and address its transport impacts in a sustainable manner and are required to have no significant adverse transport or associated air quality and noise impacts on the local and wider environment, particularly on the strategic road network. Policy DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals must ensure that safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards.
7. The property is situated on a straight, busy section of Victoria Road, which is a classified road. On-street parking is available. The footpath in front of the site is well-used by pedestrians. The use of the front area of the appeal site for vehicle parking would be likely to involve vehicles accessing the crossover and hardstanding/parking area which would involve either reversing in or out of the site directly into or out of the flow of traffic. This manoeuvre would be likely to lead to increased risk of collisions with vehicles or with pedestrians on the footpath. It would also be likely to require traffic on Victoria Road to slow down or stop which would be detrimental to highway safety and to the convenient and free flow of traffic. I note these are also the conclusions of the Highway Authority.
8. On this issue I find that the proposed crossover would result in unacceptable risks to highway and pedestrian safety and be contrary to policies T4 of the London Plan (2021) and policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

Visual amenity and character

9. Turning to the issue of visual amenity, the creation of the on-site parking area would involve the loss of the boundary treatment to the site frontage and also the majority of the soft landscaped front area, and the grass verge. These features contribute to a pleasant and vegetated streetscape which in turn brings visual amenity and character to the area. I have considered if any planning conditions might be attached to a permission which might appropriately mitigate the harm to visual amenity, but I do not consider that specifying surfacing materials and/or specifying planting could sufficiently compensate for the loss of amenity.
10. Consequently, on this issue I find that the proposed crossover and hardstanding would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the streetscene and would be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic (2012) and policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).
11. The appellant indicates that her parents are to occupy the appeal dwelling. I have considerable sympathy with the problems that they have already encountered with on-street parking, with the appellant's concerns about their safety if not able to park on the drive, and with the medical problems outlined in the submitted evidence. I note that the use of the rear parking space via the private access road involves opening and closing gates and it is said that the appellant's parents would not be able to do this. However, I have to bear in mind that future occupants of the appeal dwelling are unlikely to have such problems and as such I can only give that consideration limited weight.

12. I have weighed all the appellant's concerns and representations against the harm to visual amenity and harm to highway and pedestrian safety which I have identified above, but those matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

13. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector