
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2017

by J Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3173483
67 Bishops Road, Hayes UB3 2TF

- 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 V Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 51120/APP/2016/4296, dated 27 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey, 1 bedroom infill dwelling on land adjacent to 67 Bishops Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - parking provision and highway safety;
 - the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of the appeal site and No 67 Bishops Road with regard to external amenity space; and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Parking Provision and Highway Safety

3. The appeal site is located on the corner of Bishops Road and Lancaster Walk. No 67 has an existing crossover to provide vehicular access to a garage and parking in the driveway for at least 2 cars. There are no parking restrictions in the area surrounding the appeal site. Both Bishops Road and Lancaster Walk have some parking off street on the frontages of a number of residential properties, with additional parking taking place on street. The appeal site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) value of 1b (poor) which suggests that there will be a strong reliance on private cars for trip making.
4. At the time of my late morning site visit, the road was parked up with vehicles parked on the pavement, including 2 cars in front of Nos 65 and 67. It is likely that there would be further parked cars along the road in the evenings and at weekends. As a residential street, Bishops Road is unlikely to be particularly busy in terms of traffic movements, but it does serve a number of side roads

and a large amount of on-street parking would impede the flow of vehicles and create a risk to highway and pedestrian safety.

5. The appeal scheme would involve the demolition of No 67's existing garage and the provision of a new one bedroom dwelling. The appeal proposal would provide 2 off-road parking spaces, one for the existing property at No 67 and one for the proposed house. The parking space for the proposed house would lie on the frontage between No 67 and the proposed house, while No 67's parking space would be accessed from the rear of the property and would lie adjacent to the existing house's external amenity space.
6. The development would not be able to accommodate the 2 parking spaces required by the Council's parking standards for the existing 3 bedroom dwelling at No 67. The appellant states that the effect on traffic flows would be negligible and that the Council's parking standards are expressed as a maximum. However, any additional on-street parking as a result of the development would add to the existing on-street parking levels on Bishops Road and Lancaster Walk, further impeding the flow of traffic and increasing the risk to highway and pedestrian safety.
7. Concluding on this main issue, the proposed development would have a negative effect on parking provision and highway safety. Consequently, it would be contrary to policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (2012) (the Local Plan Part 2) which, amongst other things, seek to avoid prejudicing the free flow of traffic or highway and pedestrian safety and to provide sufficient parking.

Living Conditions

8. The existing house at No 67 has garden space to the front, side and rear with a single-storey flat roofed garage to the side adjacent to the access leading to 26 Lancaster Walk.
9. The proposed development would provide small rear gardens to No 67 and to the proposed house. Both No 67 and the proposed house are also proposed to have amenity space to the front of the properties. Parking would be provided within the rear garden area for No 67, while parking for the proposed house would be within the appeal site's frontage.
10. The Council's Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Layouts (2006) (HDAS) requires 3 bedroom houses to have at least 60m² garden space, while one bedroom houses should have at least 40m². The HDAS confirms that areas that are closely overlooked from roads, footpaths or windows to habitable rooms of adjoining properties will not be included in calculations of private useable garden space.
11. Much of the proposed amenity space for both the existing and proposed houses would be situated within the frontage, with rear garden areas of around 30m² and 22m² for the existing and proposed houses respectively. As the space to the frontage is not private, it is not considered to represent usable garden area and both No 67 and the proposed house would fall significantly below the Council's requirements in relation to the rear garden space for the relevant number of bedrooms provided. Furthermore, the limited amenity space available to the rear of the proposed house would be of a shape that would not be easy for future occupiers to use.

12. Concluding on this main issue, the proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of both the existing house at No 67 and the proposed dwelling. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19 and BE23 of the Local Plan Part 2 and the HDAS. Policy BE19 requires developments to complement or improve the amenity and character of an area, while policy BE23 states that new residential development should provide or maintain sufficient external amenity space and that any amenity space should be usable in terms of both shape and siting.

Character and Appearance

13. Bishops Road and Lancaster Walk are characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties of similar design. The houses are relatively closely spaced together with the exception of the pairs of houses which turn the corners onto the side streets off Bishops Road. The characteristic gaps between these corner houses and their neighbours have been eroded in a number of places, predominantly due to the presence of single-storey and two-storey side extensions to the corner houses.
14. The appeal site and its paired house, No 65, are situated on the corner of Lancaster Walk. A two-storey house has been constructed to the side of the existing property at No 65 (Ref 66928/APP/2010/2184) in the slightly larger gap between Nos 63 and 65. To the rear of Nos 65 and 67, 26 Lancaster Walk is a large building housing a number of flats. This building is accessed from vehicular and pedestrian accesses to either side of Nos 65 and 67. These accesses assist in maintaining gaps between Nos 65 and 67 and their respective neighbours.
15. The appeal scheme would be positioned at an angle to No 67, with a wide gap at the front which would narrow to a smaller gap between the properties at the rear. The proposed development would continue the building line between the corner of No 67 and No 24. The existing access between Nos 67 and 24 would be maintained, preserving the characteristic gap between properties. The spacing between the frontages of No 67 and the proposed house would remain greater than the spacing between the houses on Lancaster Walk and on the straight sections of Bishops Road. I therefore consider that the siting of the proposed house would be acceptable.
16. The proposed house is also of a similar design to surrounding houses, which are relatively simple in design and materials. In terms of its size, it is of a comparable size and scale to the recently constructed house adjacent to No 65. I consider that it would not appear incongruous within the street scene.
17. Concluding on this main issue, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would accord with policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan 2016, policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012 and policies BE13 and BE19 of the Local Plan Part 2. Amongst other things, these policies require development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, harmonise with the street scene and respond to local character. It would also follow the guidance of the HDAS which states that development should contribute positively to the appearance of an area.

Other Matters

18. I note that the proposed dwelling appears to comply with internal space standards set out at policy 3.5 of the London Plan. It would also not affect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of outlook or privacy. However, these positive aspects of the proposal and the appellant's view that the proposed development would constitute sustainable development with reference to paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework do not outweigh the negative effects of the proposed development set out above.
19. A neighbouring occupier has raised concerns regarding the number of multiple tenancies on Bishops Road and Lancaster Walk. I only have limited information on this matter. It does not alter my findings on the appeal before me.

Conclusion

20. The proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, but would have a negative effect on parking provision and highway safety and the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of No 67 and the proposed development. For these reasons, and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gilbert

INSPECTOR