



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3236344
63 Harlington Road, Uxbridge UB8 3HY

- 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 Mrs N Parmar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 1661/APP/2019/1894, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, conversion of basement to habitable use to allow for conversion of dwelling into 1 x 1-bed dwelling and 1 x 2-bed dwelling, involving alterations to side elevation and alterations to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, conversion of basement to habitable use to allow for conversion of dwelling into 1 x 1-bed dwelling and 1 x 2-bed dwelling, involving alterations to side elevation and alterations to roof at 63 Harlington Road, Uxbridge UB8 3HY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1661/APP/2019/1894, dated 3 June 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule at the end of this decision.

Main Issues:

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - Whether the proposal would make suitable provision for the parking of vehicles highway safety; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

Parking

3. The appeal site is located adjacent to the A437 Harlington Road which I saw was well trafficked. There is no on-site parking provision proposed as part of the proposal, although I note that the existing dwelling does not provide any on-site parking either. I also saw that there were parking restrictions on the extent of the A437 in the vicinity of the appeal site.
4. The appeal site has a PTAL rating of '2' which indicates a poor level of accessibility to public transport. Although there are bus stops within relatively

close proximity to the site, mindful of the PTAL rating I consider that these would not provide a realistic alternative to reliance on the private car due to the relative convenience of these modes of transport. Although there are shops and other services on Uxbridge Road, I do not consider that these would reduce reliance on the private car due to the walking distance involved and the range of services available.

5. The appellant contends that the existing use of the property as a 4-bedroom dwelling should provide 2 parking spaces. However, I note that the appellant's Transport Statement refers to the London Plan (LP) standards which in turn refer to up to 2 spaces per unit. Reference is made to the LP parking standards which indicate that 1-2 bedroom units should each provide no more than 1 parking space each. The appellant therefore considers that the proposal would not lead to an increase in parking demand compared to the existing use of the site. However, I am mindful that the existing use is for one household with a significant potential for shared trips and a resultant reduction in the potential number of vehicles. The proposal would lead to the creation of 2 separate households and I consider that it would be likely that each would rely on access to private vehicles, with a potential increase in demand for parking spaces.
6. There are parking restrictions on the highway to the front of the site which would prevent the parking of vehicles associated with the development on this busy highway. The appellant refers to the potential for vehicles to be parked on streets in the vicinity of the site, as would be the case with the extant dwelling. I observed that there was a number of parking spaces available in side streets within convenient walking distance of the site, although I am mindful that I visited the site during the day whereas the peak demand for parking in this residential area would be during the evening and at weekends.
7. Whilst I note that comments raised locally refer to concerns about parking capacity on side streets, there is no substantive evidence before me, such as a parking survey, as to whether there is insufficient capacity on these streets to meet an increase in parking demand which may result from the proposal. Therefore, whilst the proposal may increase parking demand in the area, I consider that such an increase would be limited and that there would be suitable on-street provision in the vicinity.
8. I therefore conclude on the basis of the evidence before me that there would be suitable on-street provision for the parking of vehicles generated by the proposal and that this would not be harmful to highway safety. As there would be no on-site parking the proposal would not exceed the maximum car parking standards set out in Policy AM14 and Annex 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2¹ (HLP2). The proposal would also not result in conditions that would be prejudicial to highway or pedestrian safety and would therefore comply with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the HLP2. Due to these local circumstances, the proposal would also not conflict with the advice of the Residential Layouts Supplementary Planning Document 2006 with regards to car parking.

Character and Appearance

9. The host property is of an unorthodox appearance, and includes an older building which has a vertical emphasis attached to a semi-detached dwelling

¹ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012

- which is of a more modern design. There are existing extensions to the rear of the buildings, including a 2-storey extension which straddles both elements.
10. It is proposed to erect a ground floor extension which would project further to the rear than the existing extensions on the appeal site and which would extend across the full width of the host buildings. The Council considers that this would fail to harmonise with the original dwelling and would further unbalance the semi-detached pair. However, mindful of the context of the existing extensions on the host buildings, the proposal would not appear as an overdominant addition to the site. Furthermore, the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling has a full width ground floor extension to the rear, although I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be wider. That said, the appeal proposal would not project further to the rear than the immediate neighbouring extension.
 11. I also saw that there was not a strong building line to the rear and that other nearby properties had ground floor extensions of a similar scale or greater than that proposed. Due to the arrangement of the appeal site and nearby buildings, the proposal would not be prominent in views from the public realm and it would not be an obtrusive or incongruous feature when viewed from surrounding properties.
 12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the wider area. The proposal would therefore not conflict with the design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies; Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the HLP2; or the advice of the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2008.

Conditions

13. The Council suggested a number of conditions, which I have considered in the light of the advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In some cases I have edited the suggested condition for clarity and enforceability and to avoid the need for pre-commencement conditions.
14. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of certainty. A condition in respect of materials is appropriate in the interests of character and appearance.
15. A condition regarding cycle parking is appropriate in the interests of sustainable transport. A condition in respect of refuse storage is required in the interests of the living conditions of future residents as well as character and appearance.
16. A condition in respect of means of enclosure is also required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of residents. This should also enable the matter of the subdivision of the rear garden area of the property to be considered, which is an issue that has been raised locally.
17. The Council has suggested a condition in respect of sound proofing between the floors of the buildings. However, the proposed dwellings would be created by the vertical division of the buildings and a condition in respect of separate floors is therefore not appropriate.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan dated 8 January 2019; Plans as Proposed DRG No. 12; and Elevations as Proposed DRG No. 13.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, details of facilities to be provided for the screened storage of refuse bins within the site shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter the facilities shall be permanently retained
- 5) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved details of covered and secure cycle storage shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained.
- 6) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved a detailed scheme for boundary walls, fences or other means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary walls, fences or other means of enclosure as approved shall be erected before the development hereby permitted is occupied.

End of Schedule