

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2016

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/15/3140293

90 North Hyde Road, Hayes UB3 4NF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohinder Pal Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application, Ref. 16885/APP/2015/3354, dated 3 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is a temporary portable cabin structure, size 7.2m x 5.0 x 2.5m for six months to one year.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The structure is already in place and the application is therefore for retrospective permission.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) the effect of the portable cabin structure ('the portacabin') on the character and appearance of the area, in particular the street scene of Harold Avenue, and (ii) the adequacy of the car parking on the site.

Reasons

4. On the first issue, I saw on my visit that the appeal site is in a predominantly residential area, with No. 90 North Hyde Road occupying a corner site with Harold Avenue. The portacabin has been placed at the rear of the dwelling, but because of the corner location and the absence of hedge or tree screening, it is in the full view of passers by in Harold Avenue.
 5. Because of its utilitarian form the portacabin draws the eye on this prominent site as being an incongruous and unsightly addition to the street scene of Harold Avenue. It is located between the appeal property and the first bungalow on this side of the road and in this position and fully exposed to public view the portacabin adversely affects the visual amenities both of these dwellings and of an otherwise mainly residential road.
 6. I acknowledge that there is sometimes a justification for such a building to be positioned on a temporary basis, but apart from storage being briefly mentioned
-

by the appellant and in the officers report (the latter also mentions an office) there is no explanation why the building is needed. In any event, the application form refers to a period of six months to one year and as the application is dated 3 September 2015 a full year has now passed.

7. On the second issue, there is a disagreement between the Council and the appellant as to the number of parking spaces that have been displaced and still remain. However, I have no information as to the demand for parking on this site, albeit I note that the appeal property has an element of business use and this suggests the figure would be higher rather than lower.
8. This indicates that there may be a potential problem with car parking, but given that (i) the period that the appellant applied for has now expired and (ii) my conclusion that the portacabin is harmful to the character and appearance of the area, I do not need to consider this matter further..
9. In summary, because of the appearance of the portacabin I consider that its continued retention would be unacceptably harmful to the street scene of Harold Avenue. This would be in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies 2012; Policies BE13, BE15 & BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies 2012, and Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
10. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR