



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2018

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3227713

30 Marlow Gardens, Hayes UB3 1QZ

- 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 R Nagpal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 20982/APP/2018/3994, dated 13 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a detached rear bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposed development on; (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the effect on highway safety with particular reference to parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located in a dense residential area of two-storey brick and tile, hip roofed dwellings.
4. Marlow Gardens is a cul-de-sac accessed from the busy highway of Bourne Avenue and is bounded to the rear by a railway line. At the end of the cul-de-sac there is a small, circular turning head adjacent a bay-fronted terrace that includes 30 Marlow Gardens on a triangular corner plot.
5. To the side of No 30 and between 28 Marlow Gardens, which forms part of an adjacent terrace, there is a tight access road which opens into a garage and parking area. There is also access to No 28a Marlow Gardens which is a chalet bungalow dwelling in the former back garden of No 28.
6. The parking area provides approximately 3 parking spaces, one of which appears to be designated to No 28a by means of a brick wall surround. There is also access to a neighbouring garage where it is likely another 2 vehicles could be parked.
7. To the rear boundary garden of No 30, which is softened by trees and hedges, there is a single storey outbuilding, small shed and a greenhouse.

8. The proposal would extend into the existing garden of No 30 and require the demolition of the existing outbuildings. The new dwelling would have 2 parking spaces and share the access with No 28, 28a, 30 and the owners of the rear garage. No 30 would have one parking space in the new arrangements.
9. The Appellant has sought to align the appearance of the proposed dwelling with other buildings in the area and it is also relatively hidden between the terraces. However, its extended footprint and scale, in this location, would result in a cramped and incongruous development.
10. I note that there is a dwelling, No 28a, in part of the former back garden of No 28, which the Appellant considers acts as a precedent. Whether or not this is appropriate development in this location, it is unclear to me whether this has been built under an earlier development plan policy and I do not have the full details of how that example arose. In any case I have considered the proposed development on the basis of its own planning merits.
11. Furthermore, the relative openness that remains in this location would be compromised by the siting and mass of this additional proposed dwelling. The infilling of this gap, which offers a break in this dense built environment, would harm the appearance of the immediate surrounding area.
12. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan (HLP) 2012, which states, amongst other things, that development should make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form and scale to protect the amenity of the surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential properties.
13. For similar reasons the proposal is contrary to aims set out in Paragraph 127(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that planning decisions should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Highway Safety

14. At the time of my afternoon site visit, I noted that there were no on-street parking opportunities available resulting in some on pavement parking. The turning head was also unavailable due to parked vehicles. Indeed, most of the parking was accommodated in the former front gardens of the existing dwellings. The lack of parking was exacerbated by the numerous crossovers and relative narrowness of the road.
15. The availability of on-street parking may well rise and fall during the course of the day, but I have limited evidence before me to support this either way.
16. In any case, the appeal site has a narrow access between the terraces and there is a pinch point at the boundaries of Nos 28 and 30. The manoeuvring of vehicles is awkward and the potential for collision between another vehicle or property wall is high.
17. My concerns are reinforced by similar issues raised by the Local Highway Authority. To the rear of the properties the existing parking arrangements are broadly adequate. However, when fully occupied the ability to manoeuvre in and out of the site would be significantly compromised.

18. The proposal would add to these already limited parking and manoeuvring arrangements and cause harm to highway safety through additional vehicle movements and the lack of available on-street parking in Marlow Gardens. There would be further harm caused by the pressure on parking spaces in the surrounding streets which could not be reasonably resolved through the imposition of a condition concerning a parking layout plan.
19. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the HLP Part 2 Saved Unitary Development Plan 2012, which state that development must be acceptable in terms of the capacity and functions of existing roads and be in accordance with Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards which require that development provides satisfactory off-street parking and turning.

20. Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

JE JOLLY

INSPECTOR