



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2026

by **Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006768

38 Lees Road, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3AT

- 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 Ms Nundeeta Jeebun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 52690/APP/2025/2810.
 - The proposed development is described as 'extend the existing dropped kerbs to the left and right of the property leaving a small kerb in between'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to extend the existing dropped kerbs to the left and right of the property leaving a small kerb in between at 38 Lees Road, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3AT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 52690/APP/2025/2810, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan and drawing numbers 532-1 and 532-2.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of highway users, with particular regard to pedestrians.

Reasons

3. Lees Road is a fairly busy highway, linking two A Class roads, and on a bus route. However, I observed that it is well lit, and relatively straight, with good forward visibility. There are no bus stops close to the appeal site, and the section of pavement in front of it is wide and unobstructed by street furniture. Bartram Close, which emerges onto Lees Road opposite the site, is a cul-de-sac serving a limited number of properties, and carries a low volume of traffic.
4. The proposed crossover would be located fairly centrally relative to the host's hard surfaced forecourt, and would not cover the whole of the plot frontage. Based on the submitted drawings, there would be a narrow flat section of pavement between the proposed crossover's tapered edge and the existing crossover which, following the erection of a boundary fence, now just serves No 40, and a wider flat section of pavement between it and the crossover which serves No 36.

5. The section of flat pavement between the scheme and No 40 would be narrow, but the section adjacent to the crossover at No 36 would provide sufficient space for pedestrians, some of whom may have pushchairs, to wait if necessary, to allow a vehicle to cross. That said, the amount of traffic serving a single dwelling would typically be very limited, and those instances would be infrequent.
6. Moreover, given the alignment of the highway and the absence of nearby street furniture, and having regard to the proposed crossover's set in from the plot's low side boundaries, pedestrians on the pavement would have a good view of vehicles accessing the site, and those drivers would have a good view of pedestrians. Thus, with appropriate care and attention by all highway users, instances where pedestrians would have to step onto the carriageway to avoid a vehicle accessing the site would be very infrequent.
7. The Council's Highways (Transportation/Traffic) consultation response states that the scheme does not comply with its Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy 2022, but does not elaborate or identify what harm would be caused. In any event, that document, which is not part of the development plan and is not a supplementary planning document, states that sites will be assessed individually and on their own merits.
8. For the above reasons, having regard to the context of this site, and assessed on its planning merits, I conclude that the scheme would not have a harmfully adverse impact on the safety and convenience of highway users.
9. It would not therefore conflict with Policies DMT 2, DMT 6 and Appendix C of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies 2020, or with Policy T4 of the London Plan 2021. Amongst other things, and in general terms, these set out that proposals must ensure that safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided, having regard to the safety of all users, including pedestrians, and that crossovers should not cover the full frontage.
10. Neither would it conflict with paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that development should not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
11. Turning to the matter of conditions, the standard time limit is necessary, as is a condition, in the interests of certainty, requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR