



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3256295

47 Fairfield Road, Uxbridge UB8 1AZ

- 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 S Khakharia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 21763/APP/2020/1035, dated 29 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of existing dwelling and erection of three storey building to provide 6 x 2-bed flats with associated car and cycle parking, amenity space and refuse storage and installation of vehicular crossover to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is currently occupied by a detached 2 storey house and its surrounding garden. It sits on Fairfield Road, adjacent to its junction with Harefield Road. The ground level falls on Fairfield Road as it approaches Harefield Road, such that the appeal site is elevated from the road level of Fairfield Road and particularly Harefield Road.
4. The existing house is set to one side of its plot, away from the corner of the roads, which leaves an open and spacious area visible from the roads, which adds to the character of the area. Fairfield Road contains a number of detached 2 storey houses and some more recent developments of flats.
5. The proposal would be significantly larger than the existing house on the appeal site. It would occupy much of the plot width and would extend forwards and rearwards to significant extents. The proposal would be sited around 1m from the boundary with its neighbour at No 45 Fairfield Road and around 3m from the side boundary with Harefield Road. The new building would be of 3 storeys with the upper floor contained within the roof.
6. The design of the proposal includes some elements common to the area, including gabled and hipped roofs and half-timbered effect on some elevations.

However, the proposed building would appear unduly wide and deep, compared to its near neighbours. The side elevations which extend upwards to the full height of the proposal would be close to the boundaries, where the proposal would appear cramped and with little visual relief. Its elevated position at the corner would mean that the long and high side elevation would be particularly prominent and overbearing when seen outside the appeal site.

7. The roof design has attempted to provide elements found in the area. However, the long elevations and relatively low sections of hipped roof would do little to disguise the large flat-roofed area. This results in a heavy and cumbersome form of roof, in my judgement and one which would have an unacceptable appearance in this prominent location. In this respect, I have noted other development within the area which have crown roofs but none in such a prominent location such as this which would present ready views of it within the street-scene. For the reasons set out, I find that the proposal conflicts with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Local Plan Part 2.
8. I have taken account of the previously refused appeal scheme (Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3239256) and to the changes that have been made to give rise to the current scheme. However, I have found that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the recently adopted Local Plan Part 2.
9. I acknowledge that the proposal would bring about some benefits, including the provision of new homes within an already-developed area and I have taken account of these and others as set out by the appellant. However, I conclude that the benefits are insufficient to outweigh the harm and conflict with the adopted policies. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR