



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Clowes BA (hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3365494

28 Hillingdon Hill, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 0JB

- 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 Mr Michael Brazier against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 79342/APP/2025/613.
- The development proposed is described as: 'we would like to drop our front garden to accommodate parking our car.'

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. During the application process the description of development changed from that on the application form. I have not been provided with any confirmation that this change was agreed by the parties. Therefore, I have used the original description which is, in any case, sufficient for the purposes of identifying the works to which the appeal relates.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached house located on the southern side of Hillingdon Hill. The dual carriageway at this location is a classified road, subject to a 40mph speed limit. There is a footway in front of the properties on Hillingdon Hill at this location, as well as controlled parking bays within the carriageway.
6. The details before me indicate the formation of a driveway/parking space within the small front garden and the formation of a vehicle crossover, amongst other things. The amount of space for vehicle parking at the proposed dwelling would be limited and would not allow for vehicles to enter and exit in a forward gear. Given the limited space to manoeuvre, it would require the occupiers to reverse into or out of

the parking area, across the footway and onto Hillingdon Road. Although a snapshot in time, I observed during my visit that Hillingdon Road is heavily trafficked and vehicle speeds are relatively high. This chimes with the description of the road by the Highway Authority and the appellant's view that 'cars come very fast.'

7. Vehicles reversing into the proposed parking area would be forced to wait in the carriageway until the road was sufficiently clear to make the manoeuvre, particularly when the car parking bays are occupied. Approaching vehicles may not anticipate stationary vehicles in the carriageway and this could lead to an increased potential for collisions.
8. Vehicles parked in the controlled parking bays, which were mostly occupied during my visit, would also adversely affect visibility sight lines of oncoming traffic, particularly in the instances where a vehicle would reverse onto Hillingdon Road. I accept that the parking bays would not always be occupied. Nonetheless at the times that they are, there would be an increased risk of conflict between all users, which would increase highway danger.
9. Furthermore, given the volume of traffic using Hillingdon Road, there would be the likelihood that the occupants would be required to wait for some time when exiting the appeal site in a vehicle, blocking the footway, and forcing pedestrians to wait or manoeuvre into the highway to get past. This would be particularly problematic for people with mobility or visual impairments and parents with small children. It would increase the likelihood of bringing pedestrians into conflict with moving vehicles and thus hazardous highway conditions.
10. As such, these manoeuvres would be dangerous due to the competing vehicular and pedestrian traffic, the speed and volume of traffic at this location, the restricted visibility when reversing and the attention required to navigate all of these competing pressures at this location. Although I note that the appellant feels unsafe accessing their car on the road, I am not satisfied that the proposal would improve highway safety for either pedestrians or drivers including the appellant.
11. To the contrary, it appears that it would put vehicles and other pedestrians at a greater risk than is presently the case. I have not been provided with any highway surveys or assessments that would lead me to take a different view. Neither have I any accident records to demonstrate that the appellant's vehicle is not secure when it is parked in the controlled bays. Consequently, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would prevent increased road danger.
12. I note that the adjoining property, No. 26, benefits from a vehicular crossover which was approved under application reference 74858/APP/2020/1577. The Council advises me that this was approved under a different iteration of the London Plan (2021). I therefore differentiate the scheme at No 26 from the subject appeal and afford it little weight. The appellant has drawn my attention to other dropped kerbs and parking spaces in the surrounding area. However, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to determine under what development plan and against which policies they were assessed, or if they have planning permission at all. Consequently, I afford them little weight.
13. I conclude that the proposed access would have an unacceptable, adverse impact on highway safety. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policy DMT 2 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2, Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy

T4 of the London Plan which amongst other things, seek to ensure safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network and prevent increased road danger. It would also fail to comply with paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to prevent unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR