



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2020

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3254922

27 The Furrows, Harefield UB9 6AT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms K Barratt against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 11718/APP/2020/1017, dated 19 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a proposed new dwelling in the rear/side space of the site address.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) describes the proposed development as a two storey, two-bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space. I have determined the appeal on this basis as it more accurately reflects what is proposed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; (ii) the adequacy of off-street parking /manoeuvring arrangements and (iii) the effect of the development upon the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining dwellings in respect of outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The area has a uniformity of design, characterised mainly by pebble dash and brick, two-storey, semi-detached houses with hipped roofs and with double height front bays with pitched roofs above. The dwellings have small, front amenity spaces often given over to off-street parking. There is a general rhythm of open spaces between properties emphasising an overall sense of spaciousness around them. While some of the dwellings have been altered and extended, there is still a common design theme to the area. The aforementioned attributes add positively and distinctively to its character and appearance.

5. The appeal site lies at a right-angled junction to the building lines of the houses immediately adjoining it on The Furrows and those on Hillside. There is a common access to the adjoining properties to the site, leading to a flat-roofed garage building with two separate garage doors. The garages are set back from the house frontages and at an angle to them and in the space between. The proposal is to demolish the garage adjoining No 27 the Furrows but to retain the other.
6. The proposed dwelling would also be set back into the space between the two dwellings and at an angle to them, unrelated to the general layout of the area.
7. I find that the proposed dwelling, by its siting would significantly and adversely depart from the design layout of the area and would have a cramped incongruous appearance in the street scene, being inserted into the angle between the existing dwellings.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not therefore accord with the design aims of policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local plan: Part One-Strategic Policies (2012)(HLP), policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Local Plan: Part Two-Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP); policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) (LP); the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (LPSPG), or with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework).

Off street parking

9. The proposed development is for a detached two-storey dwelling. The LPA's adopted car parking standards require 2 parking spaces, and while the proposed development includes such a provision, the proposed internal garage dimensions have a width and length which would not comply with the minimum standards of the policy. On my site visit, recognising that this represented only a snapshot in time, I found a moderate level of on-street demand. However, I have no statistical or other analysis before me relating to the matters of on-street parking demand and hence I am unable to determine whether there is particular stress in the locality.
10. The proposed joint access arrangements would not provide independent, unimpeded manoeuvring space related to parking provision for the occupants of the different dwellings who would use it.
11. I conclude that the proposed development does not accord with policies DMT2 and DMT6 of the DMP which are concerned respectively with the provision of safe and efficient vehicular access and with the achievement of adequate parking provision in accordance with the Hillingdon parking standards in appendix C of the DMP.

Living conditions- privacy and outlook

12. The relationship of windows between the proposed dwelling and those of adjoining properties, being not directly opposite, would not lead to a significant loss of privacy
13. The proposal would introduce a two-storey dwelling very close to the rear garden boundaries and spaces of 27 The Furrows and 1 Hillside. There would be blank walls facing the adjoining garden spaces which would prevent any

direct overlooking and the proposed dwelling would adjoin the retained garage to No 1 Hillside.

14. However, the proposed dwelling would introduce a building into what is currently largely an open amenity space. By its presence, it would contribute significantly and adversely to a feeling of enclosure for the adjoining occupants.
15. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with the amenity aims of policy DMHB11 of the DMP and paragraph 127(f) of the Framework.

Other Matters

16. I appreciate that the proposed dwelling would boost the supply of housing in the area. However, the contribution from one dwelling would be limited, particularly in the context that there is no evidence that the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing sites. This is not a matter which alters or outweighs the harm I have found in respect of my conclusions on the main issues.

Conclusion

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

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR