
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020

by O S Woodward BA(Hons.) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3248390

24 Beechwood Avenue, Hayes UB3 1JN

- 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 Nicky Oke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 51562/APP/2019/2523, dated 26 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a new 2-bedroom property attached to the side of 24 Beechwood Avenue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council adopted the Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies in January 2020 (the Part 2 LP). This document replaces the Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies 2012, and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts & Residential Extensions, all of which have been withdrawn. I have therefore determined the appeal against the policies in the new Part 2 LP.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - highway safety, particularly with regard to the provision of car parking and access.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached residential property with side and rear garden, and front driveway. The property is on a corner plot. It lies within a suburban residential area characterised by semi-detached and terraced properties with fairly substantial gardens. Although there have been some alterations and extensions to some of the neighbouring properties, these are fairly limited and the area has largely retained its front building lines and gaps between buildings, which are important characteristics of the area. It is proposed to erect a side extension to form a new 2-bedroom house, with

associated rear garden utilising part of the existing garden. An off-street parking space is proposed to the front.

5. The proposed extension would unbalance the existing semi-detached properties. It would retain the same roof ridge and eaves lines as the existing building, be of the same depth, and would widen towards the rear due to a splayed flank elevation. In addition, the proposed windows to the 1st floor level would be larger than the existing windows at this level, indicating a greater hierarchy to the extension than the existing building. Consequently, the proposal would not read as a subordinate extension.
6. Although a 1m gap would be retained to the side boundary, at 2-storeys in height this would still be intrusive and overbearing on Lime Grove. The proposed extension would infill an important and characteristic gap on a corner plot and would project forward of the established existing building line along Lime Grove, harming the street scene.
7. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area. It would fail to comply with the relevant parts of Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Part 2 LP which, amongst other criteria, seek high quality design.

Highway safety

8. The Part 2 LP sets out, in Appendix C Table 1, parking standards of two spaces per dwelling, with each space to be 2.4 m by 4.8 m in size, and to be able to be entered and exited in a forward gear. One car parking space has been proposed, representing a shortfall on the two spaces required by policy. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed space is 4.8m in length, due to the curve of the pavement cutting across part of the space. The proposed space would also block access to the retained front courtyard of no.24, thereby preventing car parking to the existing property.
9. It is therefore likely that the proposal would lead to an increase in on-street car parking, and/or cars overhanging the footway while using the proposed space. No information has been provided by the appellant to assess what the effect would be of creating further demand for on-street parking. The surrounding roads provide a mixture of off-street driveway parking, on-street parking, and parking partially on footways. It is fairly haphazard and any increase in on-street car parking could lead to a detrimental effect on the free flow of traffic and highway safety.
10. The access to the proposed space is on the corner of a road junction. It would at least partially use an existing dropped kerb. However, in comparison to the existing situation, it is proposed to change the boundary walls and the angle that cars would drive over the kerb to access the space. The proposed space could not be entered and exited in a forward gear. Insufficient information has been provided with regard to visibility splays, and no information on car tracking has been provided. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the proposed space could be safely accessed.
11. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the proposed car parking space could be safely accessed, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal would not lead to unsafe parking on the site or to an increase in on-street parking

that would harm highway safety and the free flow of traffic. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the relevant parts of Policy DMT6 of Part 2 of the LP which, amongst other criteria, requires that proposals do not have a deleterious impact on street parking provision or congestion.

Other Matters

12. I have taken into consideration the fact that the proposal would be for the redevelopment of a brownfield site but this does not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the area and highway safety that I have identified.
13. In support of the appeal, my attention has been drawn to other properties in the area that have received planning permission for extensions. I have reviewed the permissions and they do not provide precedent for the appeal proposal. The 66 Beechwood Avenue proposal was for rear, roof and porch extensions, not a large side extension. 56 Beechwood Avenue is a detached property of an entirely different character to the appeal building. The lock-up garage site is a corner site, and the proposal was not attached to existing buildings.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

O S Woodward

INSPECTOR