

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2017

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/16/3163780

85 Larch Crescent, Hayes, Middlesex UB4 9EB

- 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 Mrs Narinder Kaur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 61953/APP/2016/1171, dated 11 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is new 2 bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. An amended plan has been provided with the appeal. The plan shows revised car parking arrangements. I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by my consideration of the amended plan and I have therefore taken it into account in my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect of the proposed parking arrangements on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is an area of land between the two-storey, end-terraced property of 85 Larch Crescent and the detached, two-storey property of 85A Larch Crescent. The surrounding area is predominately residential and generally characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced housing, although there are some three-storey block of flats to the south and east. The properties are generally set back from the road and there is a considerable amount of open space throughout the estate. Whilst they vary in size, the gaps between properties nevertheless make a significant contribution to the open and spacious character of the area.
 5. The appeal site forms a gap which separates a terrace of four properties from the detached property of No 85A. The gap also offers partial views of the
-

- gardens and properties on Mimosa Road to the rear. As such, it makes a positive contribution to the prevailing character of the street scene.
6. It is proposed to construct a two bedroom, two-storey dwelling with associated parking and amenity space. I note that there is a mixture of houses, bungalows and three-storey blocks of flats in the area. However, the proposed dwelling would be attached to both No 85 and No 85A and would, as a result, substantially increase the width of the existing terrace, incorporating the detached property of No 85A within it. Moreover, it would infill the space between No 85 and No 85A. The loss of this gap would erode the importance of its contribution towards the open character of the street scene. As such, the dwelling would appear unduly cramped and would result in an obtrusive addition to the street scene.
 7. I note that there is a terrace of greater width elsewhere on Larch Crescent. However, those properties appear as a cohesive row of properties. In contrast, the appeal proposal would result in a terrace which would appear somewhat disjointed and at odds with the form of others in the area.
 8. I also note that planning permission was granted on appeal in March 2008¹ for the erection of a two-storey, three-bedroom attached dwelling at the appeal site. However, that decision pre-dates the grant of planning permission for, and the erection of, No 85A. As such, circumstances have significantly changed in the intervening period and I therefore afford the now lapsed permission little weight.
 9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012 which states that all new development should improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. It would also conflict with Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012 (LPP2) which seek to resist development which fails to harmonise with the street scene, that new development complements or improves the character of the area and that residential buildings of two or more storeys in height should be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary. Finally, the proposal would conflict with the guidance set out in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Layouts 2006.

Highway Safety

10. Policy AM14 of the LPP2 states new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards. The Council's standards indicate that new dwellings with curtilage parking should provide 2 spaces per dwelling.
11. Part of the appeal site is currently used as off-street parking for 85 Larch Crescent. The proposal before the Council indicated that a single off-street parking space would be provided for the proposed dwelling, utilising the existing vehicular crossover for access. This would result in the loss of off-street parking for the existing property, No 85.

¹ Council Ref: 61953/APP/2006/3203

12. However, the appellant has provided a revised plan which shows that two off-street parking spaces would be provided for the proposed dwelling with an overall width of around 5.85m and around 10m² of landscape to the front of the property. Moreover, the plan shows a new crossover would be installed to the front of No 85 and that two off-street parking spaces would be provided for the existing property. As a result, the proposal would provide sufficient off-street parking for the proposed dwelling and No 85 in line with the Council's parking standards.
13. The Council has had the opportunity to comment on the amended plan but has not done so. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I see no reason why the amended plan would not address the Council's concerns. Thus, I am satisfied that the proposal would not lead to harmful levels of on-street parking.
14. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed parking arrangements would not have a harmful effect on highway safety. As a consequence, the proposal would accord with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the LPP2 which state that permission will not be granted for developments which will likely prejudice highway safety.

Other Matters

15. I note the appellant is willing to make payments towards both the Council and the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, CIL payments are designed to mitigate the impact of development on infrastructure in the area. Such payments would therefore be a neutral factor, rather than a benefit.
16. A previous appeal for a dwelling on the site was dismissed on appeal in 2011². In that instance the Inspector had concerns that the scheme would fail to make adequate provision for people with disabilities. I note that this appeal proposal would incorporate features for disabled access to overcome those concerns. However, the lack of harm in respect of disabled access would not outweigh the harm which I have identified in respect of the character and appearance of the area.
17. I note the relatively sustainable location of the appeal site and the contribution the proposal would make towards boosting the supply of housing in the area. However, such benefits would be modest in their extent and are outweighed by the harm which I have identified.

Conclusions

18. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway safety, it would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. That is the prevailing consideration. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR

² APP/R5510/A/11/2150638