



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3225297

13 Cherry Tree Avenue, West Drayton UB7 8DB

- 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 Chelsea Findlater against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74377/APP/2018/4237, dated 4 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as front extension to existing house to incorporate a porch depth to match adjoining property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - Highway safety, with regards to the adequacy of parking provision.

Reasons

Highway safety

3. The appeal property is located within a residential area. I observed that car parking in Cherry Tree Avenue and the surrounding streets generally takes place within front gardens, or dedicated pavement bays and laybys, which keeps the relatively narrow residential streets clear of parking and traffic congestion.
4. The entire front garden of the appeal property is paved and appears capable of currently accommodating two vehicles, albeit with some manoeuvring because of the front boundary wall. However, the proposed extension, including the steps, would reduce the area available for parking. It may still be possible for a single vehicle to park diagonally, but without any information to demonstrate how two vehicles could be parked wholly within the reduced front garden area, I am not convinced that it would be possible. This is likely to result in the need to park a second vehicle outside the property. I note the extension on the adjoining property No 15, but it contains a garage and the driveway in front is not obstructed by steps, so it is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal in these respects.

5. The parking bays and laybys in the vicinity appeared to be well used, even in the middle of the day. Those on Apple Tree Avenue, which is immediately around the corner from the appeal site, also appeared to primarily serve properties that do not have their own in-curtilage parking and therefore I expect them to be in high demand, particularly on an evening. The pavement bay directly outside the appeal property has a street lighting post in the middle of it preventing its use. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that on-street parking would always be readily available in close proximity to the appeal property.
6. The proposal is therefore likely to cause parking displacement, which could lead to increased instances of dangerous and obstructive parking in the vicinity, such as on footways or across driveways to the detriment of the free and safe flow of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on highway safety by reason of inadequate parking provision. This would be contrary to saved Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies November 2012 (UDP), which requires two parking spaces in line with the adopted car parking standards to enable all residents (and their visitors) to park off-street. Although this policy predates the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, there is clear and compelling justification for provision of off street parking, in so far as it relates to this particular property and appeal proposal, and therefore I give this policy considerable weight in my decision. There is also conflict with the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (2008) (the SPD), which requires the layout of the front garden to allow a car to park at right angles to the road without overhanging the pavement.

Character and appearance

8. The housing in Cherry Tree Avenue and surrounding streets is arranged in two distinct forms, either as semi-detached pairs or in terraces of four. The consistency in appearance and building lines is maintained despite some front porches and extensions.
9. The appeal property is of the terraced type. Its adjoining neighbour No 15 has already been unobtrusively extended to the front, single storey. The appeal proposal would be quite similar in appearance and in matching materials to the building, but not as wide because it does not include a garage. It would not extend across the entire frontage, nor would its depth extend beyond the extension at No 15. As such it would be clearly subordinate in scale and unobtrusive in the street scene. I also saw other similar examples in Pear Tree Avenue, Peach Tree Avenue and Apple Tree Avenue, which I did not regard as intrusive features in the street scene.
10. The SPD sets out guidelines for extensions, but for the reasons above I find no significant conflict with its guidelines on front extensions and porches.
11. Consequently, the development would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the building and area. As such, the proposal does not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), saved UDP Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19, and the SPD. Collectively, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that extensions are compatible with the existing building and do not damage the

character of the area. However, this does not outweigh my findings in respect of highway safety harm.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR