



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2026

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6011268

364 Victoria Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon 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 reference is 3415/APP/2026/41.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. A new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 17 August 2026. It replaces the previous version to which the evidence refers. The Framework is a material consideration, and I have taken it into account. It does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety and on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

Highway and pedestrian safety

4. The proposal is to install a new vehicle crossover to provide access from Victoria Road to the existing hard surface area in front of the appeal property for off-street parking. A similar proposal was recently refused planning permission on application and at appeal.
5. During my mid-afternoon site visit, I saw that the volume of traffic using Victoria Road as it passes the site was considerable. These conditions are consistent with its role as a classified road. The footway adjacent to the site was also well-used. Although the number of vehicle movements using the new crossover would be relatively modest, the appeal scheme would result in motorists slowing down and either turning into or out of a busy road and crossing a well-used footway.
6. As the frontage of No 364 is modest in size, there would be no realistic opportunity for a vehicle to both enter and exit in forward gear. A driver using the new crossover would therefore need to reverse into or out of the site onto the adjacent

highway. Such a manoeuvre would pose an obvious and significant risk to highway safety for both road and footway users.

7. Firstly, it would increase the risk of a collision with other vehicles or pedestrians on the footway. Secondly, it would necessitate traffic on Victoria Road to slow down or stop that could be a hazard to road users. Thirdly, vehicles emerging from the site and waiting on the adjacent footway for a gap in the traffic may also obstruct pedestrian movements. Given these local conditions, I have little doubt that introducing a new vehicle crossover, as proposed, would create an unacceptable risk to highway and pedestrian safety.
8. I observed several existing crossovers and hardstandings along Victoria Road, including at the properties on either side of the site, many of which require reversing manoeuvres. The existence of these arrangements does not establish that the proposed crossover would be safe. Nor do these examples persuade me that the additional risks arising from the proposal would be acceptable.
9. Particular reference is made to the Council's decision to approve a new vehicle crossover at 167 Victoria Road, with the decision notice provided. This evidence does not establish that the circumstances and the highway conditions at No 167, which occupies a different section of the road, are directly comparable to those at the site. As such, I attach limited weight to this decision in support of the appeal.
10. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on highway and pedestrian safety. It is therefore contrary to Policy T4 of The London Plan and Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (LP Part 2). These policies state that development proposals should not increase road danger nor contribute to the deterioration of safety for road users.

Character and appearance

11. A hard surface would be introduced across a grass verge alongside the carriageway in front of the site. This verge, together with the nearby roadside trees, makes a positive contribution to the street scene by visually softening the highway and its associated infrastructure. By introducing an additional hard surface, the proposal would diminish the role and value of this greenery to the detriment of the area's visual character. Alternative surface materials or additional landscaping within the site would not satisfactorily mitigate this visual impact. Although other existing crossovers interrupt the verge along Victoria Road, this does not negate the contribution made by the remaining greenery.
12. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the local area. It is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies and LP Part 2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12. These policies state that development should respond appropriately to its surroundings and provide suitable landscaping.

Other matters

13. The appellant has explained that the existing parking arrangements at the rear of the appeal property involve an access that is narrow and unlit, and a lengthy walk that presents difficulties for elderly and less mobile occupiers. I accept that these circumstances make the existing arrangements difficult for the current occupiers of

- No 364. In that context, parking just in front of the dwelling would provide benefits in terms of accessibility and convenience, to which I attach significant weight.
14. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This includes the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share protected characteristics and those who do not. The proposal would help minimise disadvantages associated with the occupiers' age and mobility and attach significant weight to these benefits. However, the safety risks associated with the proposed crossover would also affect others, including pedestrians that may have similar characteristics. Having regard to these competing considerations, I find that the accessibility benefits do not outweigh the unacceptable risks to highway and pedestrian safety.
 15. The appellant raises Articles 6 and 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 1 of the First Protocol, as incorporated by the Human Rights Act 1998. In relation to Article 6, this appeal provides an independent determination of the planning merits, including consideration of the appellant's concerns about the Council's reliance on previous refusals, its changing officer advice and the application of successive planning policies. I am satisfied that this appeal provides an independent and fair determination of the proposal, notwithstanding the appellant's concerns about the Council's handling of the planning application.
 16. I find that Article 8 is engaged, as the proposal concerns the occupiers' ability to access and enjoy their home. Dismissing the appeal would prevent them from obtaining a more accessible parking arrangement, although it would not prevent continued occupation of the dwelling. Any interference with their rights under Article 8 or Article 1 of the First Protocol would therefore be limited. Such interference would be in accordance with the statutory planning framework and would pursue the legitimate aim of protecting public safety, including the safety of other road and footway users. Given the inherent risks associated with the proposed crossover, which could not be satisfactorily overcome by conditions, such as a personal planning permission, dismissal is necessary and proportionate. It strikes a fair balance between the occupiers' interests and the wider community.
 17. The appellant also refers to section 19(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This concerns the preparation of local development documents. It does not govern the determination of individual planning applications.
 18. The Council's Case Officer initially indicated that there were no objections in principle and expressed a preference for the centred crossover over an alternative layout. That position changed after the Case Officer had considered the previous appeal decision. Although I appreciate the appellant's concern about this change of stance, the earlier advice given does not bind the Council from reaching a different view. The earlier appeal decision is a relevant consideration. However, it does not predetermine the outcome of future proposals, including this appeal, which should be assessed on their own merits, as I have done in this instance.
 19. The Council raises concern that the proposal, if permitted, would encourage further crossovers along Victoria Road. However, other proposals would need to be assessed on their own merits. This concern does not add to the identified harm.

Planning balance and conclusion

20. I attach significant weight to the accessibility benefits for the occupiers of No 364. However, the unacceptable risks to highway and pedestrian safety would substantially outweigh those benefits. Policy TR6(4) of the Framework states that development proposals should be refused if they would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of development within settlements under Policy S4 of the Framework does not indicate that planning permission should be granted.
21. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR