
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

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

Decision date: 8 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3173730

1 Dulverton Road, Ruislip Manor, Middlesex HA4 9AE

- 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 James Barnes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 71505/APP/2016/4212, dated 26 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a "small detached house".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the provision of parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is an irregular shaped corner plot, currently hosting a residential dwelling which has been subdivided to form two units, and is attached to 2 Linden Avenue. Opposite the site is a 2/3 storey mixed use development, and also a large open car park, beyond which the area adopts a more commercial feel. The immediate area around the appeal site is primarily residential in nature, with a mixture of dwelling types. A number of the plots include open space to the side boundaries, which contribute to a beneficial sense of space between the houses. The appeal site contributes to this, partly due to it being located on a prominent corner site, which provides a variance in built form as a result of the angle of the property to the road, and creates a generous visual break in the built form along the street scene.
4. The proposal would involve the demolition of the single storey garage currently on the site and erection of a one bed, two storey dwelling in its place. Although the proposal would be one bedroom, and therefore smaller than others in the area, it would be nearly six metres in width, and would substantially fill the gap between Nos 1 and 3 Dulverton Road. This would significantly erode the sense of space that the site currently exhibits, which would be detrimental to the character of the area at this point in the street scene.

5. With the exception of the porch, the main front building line of the proposal would not extend past that of No 3. However, due to the siting of the proposal within a corner plot it would essentially infill the plot, and would be prominent when travelling onto Dulverton road from Linden Avenue. Although the proposal would maintain a gap of approximately four metres, taking into account the existing built form on the site, the overall appearance of the site would appear cramped and out of keeping with the street scene.
6. The appellant has referred to a number of dwellings that have been granted which, in their view, are comparable to the proposal. I appreciate the appellant may be frustrated that these developments have been permitted. The development of these sites has eroded the spacious character of the plots, and this is to the detriment of the character of the area in general. However, it does not automatically follow that additional developments that would further harm the character and appearance of the area should be allowed. Each case must be considered independently and I have determined this appeal based on its own merits.
7. As such, I find that the proposal would fail to harmonise with the existing character of the area, and would not complement the amenity of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) with regards to maintaining the quality of the built environment. It does not comply with Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) with regards to harmonising with the surrounding properties. It would fail to relate to the surrounding street pattern and therefore does not accord with the design aims of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Layouts.

The provision of parking

8. No 1 Dulverton Road is currently subdivided into two properties; No 1 and No 1A. Due to the open area to the side of the property and the existing garage there are currently three parking spaces provided on site.
9. The plan submitted for the proposal identifies parking for two cars in respect of the proposed dwelling, and the retention of one parking space for the existing property. Accordingly, the new dwelling element of the proposal would appear to comply with the Council's parking space standards. However, it would result in the loss of existing parking for the two units at No 1, identifying that one space would be retained, which would conflict with the Council's parking standards.
10. I note that the appeal site is located close to public transport links and local facilities and services, and the appellant asserts that there is no need for a car. However, they have provided sufficient parking for the proposal, and therefore would appear to accept that it would be necessary to provide parking. In my view, the reduction in parking for the current dwellings, contrary to the Council's parking standards, would be unacceptable.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not comply with the Council's parking standard may lead to increased pressure on the local road network. It therefore fails to comply with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) insofar as they seek to address parking and highway matters.

Conclusion

12. For the reason given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR