



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 March 2021

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3261381

16 Priory Cottages, Harvil Road, Harefield, Middlesex UB9 6AS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Lisa Haynes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 39392/APP/2020/938, dated 6 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a new attached two storey house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for a new attached two storey house at 16 Priory Cottages, Harvil Road, Harefield, Middlesex UB9 6AS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 39392/APP/2020/938, dated 6 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place, and the development shall be carried out as approved.
 - 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Site Plan 16, Priory Cottages 1:1250.
 - 5) No development shall commence until there shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority details of step-free access via the principal private entrance. The measures implemented as approved shall be retained thereafter.
 - 6) The dwelling hereby permitted shall be built to Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) of the Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document M, Volume 1 2015 edition, and all such provisions shall remain in place for the life of the building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was made in outline, with all detailed matters reserved for later consideration. An indicative scheme to illustrate how the site might

accommodate the proposed dwellings is presented. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

3. Since the Council's decision, the New London Plan has been published, continuing the requirement for development to complement local character. I assess the case on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. It is located within a row of pairs of semis on one side of Harvil Road. The host row of dwellings comprises pairs of twentieth century, semi-detached two-storey houses with brick and pebble dashed walls, and hipped slate roofs. Some variation of built form has established within the row, arising from extensions that have reduced uniformity and separation between pairs of houses. Views of shops to the south-east and countryside on the other side of Harvil Road gently add further variety to the scene.
6. Judging by the indicative scheme, the proposed house is likely to extend from the gable end of the host dwelling and reduce the separation gap to the neighbouring pair of dwellings. The Council is concerned that the proposal would appear disproportionate and incongruous.
7. However, it is feasible that the proposed house would retain a noticeable separation gap from the neighbouring side boundary, and achieve a set-back behind the host building's main elevations. It would also provide a sense of visual balance with the extended neighbouring house at No 17. These factors, along with the established suburban variation of form and space, would help the proposed house to assimilate into its setting.
8. Taking the above together, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) and the character and appearance policy of the London Plan, which seek to ensure that development complements local character and context.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the planning conditions suggested by the Council. I have made minor drafting changes in the interests of precision. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed conditions in respect of the reserved matters, timing and plans. Conditions covering accessible design and construction are necessary to ensure development accessibility and quality.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Cooper INSPECTOR