
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2016

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 May 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/15/3140868

Land adjacent to 14 and 15 East Walk, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 3JJ

- 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 Anton Raimondo (Southern Capital Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 63226/APP/2015/3525, dated 21 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is the construction of 2 single storey 3-bed attached dwellings with amenity space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwellings on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. East Walk is part of an area of social housing dating, according to the Council, from the 1920s-1930s. The site is located within an area designated by the Council as The East and West Walk Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The houses are arranged as semi's and short terraces of similar designs and materials, with pantiled hipped roofs, small catslide roofs over the flank walls, side entrances and central stacks.
4. The properties are arranged in a cruciform shaped layout of narrow cul-de-sacs with dwellings arranged behind front gardens. At the head of the cul-de-sac is a terrace of 4 dwellings and to either side of this terrace are matching green spaces which are visible from the street. This arrangement at the end of the cul-de-sac provides an attractive symmetry and a pleasant openness within an otherwise dense pattern of development. Therefore the spaces contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. I appreciate that the scheme has been reduced from that of the previously dismissed appeal¹ and that the houses would be single storey; to the rear of the site; and would retain a gap between the adjacent dwellings so that views of houses beyond would remain. Nevertheless, in spite of its green roof, the development would take up a large proportion of the site, extending across its

¹ APP/R5510/W/15/3006538

full width right up against its boundaries. It would still be visible from the street and would spoil the existing symmetry and open nature of the end of the cul-de-sac.

6. The ASLC does not have the same status as a Conservation Area. However, the National Planning Policy Framework says that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed dwellings would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) (UDP) which indicates that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fails to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area which the local planning authority considers it desirable to retain or enhance. It would also conflict with UDP Policies BE5 and BE19; Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Layouts; and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan which, in combination, require that new development harmonises, complements or improves the character of an area and should have regard to the form of an area.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would deliver energy efficient housing on underused land but these matters do not overcome the harm I have identified. I have considered all other matters raised, including the objections from neighbours, but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR