



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3243444

16 Frays Avenue, West Drayton, UB7 7AF

- 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 Manjeet Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 53156/APP/2019/1392, dated 24 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with a new detached dwelling of pitched roof design extending to two stories in height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the application has been amended by the Council and described as, 'Erection of two storey, 3-bed, detached dwelling, involving demolition of existing bungalow and garage'. I concur that this accurately describes the proposed development.
3. The Council has advised that the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies (2012) against which the original planning permission was determined, has now been withdrawn. The policies that are relevant in this decision-making process are Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5 and DMHB 11 of the adopted London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies and Site Allocations and Designations January 2020 (LP Part 2). I apply great weight to this adopted policy.
4. The Site Plan Drawing No: 3260-06/FP does not correspond with the Proposed Elevations Drawing No: 3260-05/FP in respect of the side elevation facing Lawn Avenue as the fenestration arrangement is different.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a detached bungalow designed broadly in an 'L' shape located on a corner plot with Frays Avenue and Lawn Avenue in the West Drayton area. It has a generous rear garden that meets the River Colne. The

surrounding character contains a variety of styles and designs including dormer bungalows, detached 'A' framed houses, modern new builds and two storey houses.

7. The appeal site is located within the Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The ASLC includes areas that possess sufficient architectural, townscape and environmental quality to make them of considerable local value. Therefore the appeal site is a non-designated heritage asset.
8. The corner turning nature of the site and limited height of the boundary wall results in the site appearing highly visible within the streetscene, although the existing bungalow is low level and discrete in its setting as it wraps around the corner with Lawn Avenue. The adjacent dwelling of No 14 Frays Avenue is by far the most prominent dwelling along this side of the road within close proximity to the appeal site. It stands proud within the streetscene and is highly visible when viewed from the south, towards the junction where Lawn Avenue meets Frays Avenue.
9. The dwelling at the scale and massing proposed would physically compete with the proportions of this adjacent dwelling. Given the corner plot, the positioning of the dwelling within the site, with reduced space to both sides, would further highlight its prominence. The proposed development would be especially pronounced as No 18 Frays Avenue is set back within the site with an open front garden, further exposing clear views towards the appeal site from the south.
10. The proposal merges a number of design combinations including a peaked gable end to part of the front elevation; a dormer window; half hipped roof; cat slide roof. Whilst there is a variety of architectures within the area, the combination of these would not harmonise with the surrounding area and would therefore appear out of context with its environment, thus appearing as a disjointed and incongruous form of development. Overall, its large and bulky mass, together with the design combinations, would not respect its context. Instead, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street-scene.
11. Moreover, the proposed side elevation has been designed as a long expanse of brickwork with various roof forms visible. Given this appeal site is located on a corner plot, and as the side elevation would be positioned close to the boundary, would further emphasise its scale and discordant nature. This would not harmonise with the local area, or make a positive contribution to the ASLC.
12. There are examples of new build dwellings within the area, however these do not share precisely the same characteristics as the appeal site. Some are located between other houses and are of a less prominent nature. No 18 Frays Avenue is also located on a corner plot and has been extensively altered, however, this dwelling is sited further back into the site from Frays Avenue with an uncomplicated roof form, and cannot be directly compared to this new build proposal. I have had regard to the other examples elsewhere, nevertheless, each decision is made on its own individual merits.
13. Whilst the harm to the ASLC would be less than substantial, taking into account paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there are no identified public benefits which would outweigh such harm.

14. Overall, the combination of the design, bulk, massing and setting, within this prominent location, the proposal would not complement the character and appearance of the street-scene or the ASLC. Therefore the proposal would be in conflict with the LP Part 2, Policies DMHB 1 and DMP5 that seeks development to avoid harm to heritage assets, and in respect of the ASLC, for replacement buildings to contribute positively to its character, and Policy DMHB 11 for new development to harmonise with the local context, take account of scale, mass and bulk, amongst other design aims. It would also conflict with the design aims and objectives of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Layouts July 2006, to achieve good design that is appropriate in its context.

Other Matters

15. The effect of the proposal on 14 Frays Avenue has been brought to my attention. I am aware of the objections raised to the proposal, however the Council have raised no concern in this regard. In any case, as I am dismissing the appeal, there is no requirement to comment on the matter further or other objections raised.
16. Issues pertaining to Council negotiations to reach an acceptable design solution are not within my remit to comment upon.
17. Despite the use of high-quality materials and the efficient use of land, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

18. For these reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR