



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2026 by F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002010

29 Richards Close, Hillingdon, Hayes, UB3 5EA

- 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 Raksha Grewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 44750/APP/2025/2206.
 - The development proposed is described as “proposed dropped kerb, front driveway with permeable block paved material to create vehicular access.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. 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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development has been taken from the application form.
4. From the evidence before me and what has been observed on site, a paved driveway has been installed. Whereas the proposed dropped kerb, which would create a wider access into the plot, has not yet been constructed. In the interests of clarity, this appeal shall be determined on the basis of the plans and drawings before me.

Main Issue

5. The Council raise no issue with regard to the paved driveway area. I have no evidence before me that would lead me to conclude otherwise. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed widened vehicular access on pedestrian and highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is located within Richards Close, a residential cul-de-sac and comprises a semi-detached property with open frontage covered in hardstanding which is used as parking for two vehicles. Access from the parking area is provided by an existing 3 metre wide dropped kerb located on the edge of the appeal site's frontage, crossing over the pedestrian footway. Within the cul-de-sac, it was observable that the majority of properties had off-street, private parking spaces.

However, there were some on-street parking spaces available as part of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). At the time of my visit Richards Close was quiet in terms of highways activity. However, I am mindful that this visit was conducted on a mid-week morning and as such provided only a snapshot in time. It is likely that highway activity would increase at other times, such as in the mornings and evenings when nearby residents leave and return from work.

7. The appeal proposal involves extending the existing dropped kerb by a further 3 metres, resulting in a total width of 6 metres, extending across two thirds of the appeal site's frontage.
8. The Council has referred to policy T4 (F) of the London Plan (LP) and policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) (HLP II DMP). Combined, these require development to ensure safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network in alignment with the Council's standards including having no deteriorative impacts on highway or pedestrian safety and movement. Appendix 4 of the HLP II DMP (Appendix 4) sets out that Vehicle crossovers must be constructed to Council standards and that, as a guide, the width of a standard domestic crossing is 2.5 metres at the back of the footway, increasing to 4.6 metres at kerbside. It goes on to set out that crossovers which cover the full frontage may not be permitted, within the context of having regard to highway safety.
9. The Council's Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy (DVFCP) contains technical guidance in produced by the HA which states that crossovers should not exceed 5m. Although the guidance does not form part of the statutory development plan, it does relate to highway safety within the context of the Highways Act. Therefore, the DVFCP is a material consideration that can be attributed weight, albeit limited, within this recommendation.
10. Within the above context, I consider that the extension of the dropped kerb would not maintain or create a suitable pedestrian environment on the footway and would increase the potential for conflict between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. Indeed, in combination with the existing, the proposed dropped kerb would stretch 6 metres across the entire width of the frontage of the appeal site, exceeding the standards as set out within Appendix 4 as well as the DVFCP. This would result in the loss of an existing portion of the footway that pedestrians can safely use, thus deteriorating the existing conditions of highway safety and increasing the likelihood of conflict between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles.
11. During my site visit I noted that boundaries around the site are relatively low and that vegetation would not obstruct sightlines, creating good visibility for motorists manoeuvring onto and off the site. However, these features could change in the future and cannot be relied on to create a safe environment, in contrast to the extent of protected footway available to pedestrians. Furthermore, the adverse effect on pedestrian safety would be exacerbated as the proposed and existing dropped kerb would extend towards the frontage and dropped kerb of No 27. The combined section of unprotected footway would provide no safe refuge for pedestrians for a wide section of kerb edge. Therefore, taking the context into consideration, the proposal would not promote or encourage safe, pedestrian-friendly walking environments, a conclusion shared by the Highway Authority.

12. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to Policy T4 (F) of the LP and Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the HLP II DMP, the requirements of which are set out above. I further find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) where it seeks to promote sustainable transport in preventing development with an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

13. The appellant notes that the Council have not relied on any technical data in relation to the existing highway conditions. Whilst this may be the case, I am satisfied that the Council has proportionally and adequately articulated and substantiated the reason for its decision, enabling me to understand its concerns and consider this appeal.
14. Part of the appellant's case for the dropped kerb arises from the intention to provide an additional parking space at the property due to its siting within a PTAL 2 area (indicating low public transport connectivity) and the loss of an onsite parking space resulting from the conversion of the garage. However, the converted garage is behind the rear elevation of the dwelling and would have been accessed via the driveway to its side. This driveway is retained and could accommodate at least two further vehicles, in addition to the two spaces shown within the sites frontage and therefore the plot would continue to readily provide any reasonable on-plot parking requirements for the occupiers.
15. Furthermore, whilst Appendix 4, of the HLP II DMP, notes that it would be acceptable in policy terms for the appeal dwelling, being in a PTAL2 area, to have 1.5 spaces, this relates to a maximum standard as opposed to a minimum requirement and is achieved on site in any event. I therefore find that the proposal would not materially increase on-plot parking and therefore such provision should not be regarded as a benefit of the scheme. As such, I attribute this limited weight to these considerations, which do not alter my recommendation.
16. The appellant contends that similar dropped kerbs are present within Richards Close, but the details given do not appear to relate to a planning approval and no further information has been provided. Reference has also been made to other full width crossovers within the road. Whilst I observed these on my site visit, I have not been provided with any planning background, and it is unclear as to whether they benefit from planning permission or are unauthorised. Even so, their existence does not, in my view, provide robust justification for a proposal that would compromise highway and pedestrian safety, and they do not alter my recommendation.

Public Sector Equality Duty

17. Whilst the appellant has not explicitly referenced any equalities implications arising in the event that this appeal fails, I do note that within the evidence before me, one of the parking spaces is annotated as "Disabled Parking." Accordingly, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the Act), which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

18. The Act sets out the relevant protected characteristics which includes disability. However, it does not follow from the PSED that the appeal should succeed, and I am also mindful that personal circumstances and ownership of the land can change, but the effect of the development would be permanent. Informed by the evidence before me, in my view the adverse effects of dismissing the scheme on those with protected characteristics would be proportionate having regard to the harm identified to the conditions of highway safety. In any event, there is no robust evidence before me that indicates that in dismissing this appeal there would not be a less harmful, alternative scheme that could achieve the same outcome to those protected characteristics.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. On the basis of the reasons above and having had regard to all other matters raised including the provisions of the PSED, I consider that the harm arising from conflict with the development plan would not be outweighed. Accordingly, I recommend that this appeal is dismissed.

Finlay Bradford

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 dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR