



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2017

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/16/3165455

The Surgery, Derwent Drive, Hayes UB4 8DR

- 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 Goddards, Goddard Veterinary Group against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 5249/APP/2016/2911, dated 27 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing veterinary surgery (sui generis) and construction of 2 bedroom detached house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the eastern side of Derwent Drive close to the junction with Park Road. It is proposed to demolish the existing single storey building and erect a one and a half storey, 2 bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.
 4. Derwent Drive is characterised by 2 storey semi-detached houses with predominately hipped roofs. Whilst there have been some alterations to individual properties there is, nevertheless, consistency in terms of layout with properties set back from the road with modest front gardens enclosed by low boundary walls. A three-storey care home building is situated opposite fronting onto Park Road and Uxbridge Road. The current appeal proposal has been submitted in an attempt to resolve previous concerns raised by the Council in relation to earlier applications.
 5. The appeal site has a limited depth as it backs onto the garden and outbuilding of a residential property to the rear. The proposal has been reduced in scale and bulk compared to earlier iterations of the scheme. It would, with the exception of the porch, reflect the building line of No 2 and also maintain separation between No 2 Derwent Drive (No 2) and No 33 Park Road (No 33).
 6. However, whilst the proposal would not extend beyond the single storey conservatory of No 33 it would, nevertheless, extend beyond the main building line created by the two storey flank elevation of No 33. Moreover, the orientation of
-

the property within the plot would fail to reflect the curve in the road resulting in the south-east corner of the building being set an angle to the road.

7. Furthermore, the width to height ratio combined with the shape of the roof would result in a dwelling of horizontal proportions and a 'squat' appearance compared to surrounding properties which have a more vertical emphasis. In addition, half-hipped roofs are not a characteristic feature of the area. Taking these factors in combination, I consider that the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition, at odds with the character of the area.
8. Although the existing building may not possess any particular redeeming features, due to the single-storey nature and relatively simple design the building, nevertheless, has an ancillary and subsidiary appearance. Furthermore, the building provides an appropriate transition between the building lines of No 2 and No 33.
9. I acknowledge that there have been alterations to a number of roofs in the area which have been drawn to my attention. Nevertheless, I consider that the overall impression of the predominant roof form in the street is that of fully hipped roofs. In any event, the dwellings have generally retained their overall proportions in spite of those alterations. I also note that the 3 storey care home opposite has a half-hipped roof on the flank elevation facing Derwent Drive and also to the main bay. However, in this case the half-hipped features are appropriate in the context of the overall building which is suitably proportioned with a vertical emphasis. Consequently, none of these cases are directly comparable to the appeal proposal which limits the weight which I can attach to them in my Decision.
10. For the reasons stated, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would, therefore, be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Policies (2012), saved Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (1998) and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Layouts 2006 which taken together seek to ensure a high quality of design.
11. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with paragraphs 17 and 56 of the Framework which seek to secure high quality design and state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
12. The proposal would provide a modest contribution to housing supply and in doing so would make use of previously developed land as encouraged by the Framework. However, these benefits would not outweigh the significant harm which I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector