



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3286055

2 Wingfield Way, Ruislip HA4 6RH

- 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 & Ms Paul & Paula Haddad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 35618/APP/2021/1315, dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'construction of a new dwelling house with an off street parking space on land to the east of 2 Wingfield Way HA4 6RH'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposes a dwelling on land which currently provides for parking and soft landscaping between the side of 2 Wingfield Way and West End Road. The dwelling would be attached to No 2, and would result in a small terrace with this dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour. However, there are other terraces present on Wingfield Way, and while the majority of buildings comprise semi-detached dwellings of similar appearance, I observed alterations to some including two-storey side extensions which have eroded their symmetry. In this context, I do not find that the presence of a terrace in this location would be conspicuous.
4. Furthermore, the dwelling would be positioned on the same front building line as No 2 and would be of comparable height and two-storey depth and similar design. It would be slightly narrower, but the difference would not be large, and in my view its overall appearance would be sympathetic to the host building. Notwithstanding its second reason for refusal, the Council confirmed at appeal stage that it did not consider the development would be detrimental to the character, appearance or symmetry of the host semi-detached pair. For the reasons above, I agree, and I find that the building would not in itself be a jarring or discordant addition to the Wingfield Way street scene.
5. Be that as it may, the development would infill much of the space to the side of No 2, and the appellant has not challenged the Council's statement that it would be set around 1.4m from the boundary with West End Road. I

acknowledge that there is some variation in the West End Road building line, but the development would step notably forward of the closest dwellings on this side of the street. In addition, it would be significantly closer to the boundary with West End Road than other nearby buildings, including 237-239 and 318-326 West End Road which the appellant indicates are around 3m and 4m from their respective front boundaries. Although the difference would be less pronounced, it would also be closer than ancillary buildings associated with Westerley Court and Langdale Court. In any event, the relatively limited scale and single-storey height of these structures tempers their visual impact in the street scene, and they are not directly comparable to the appeal development.

6. I acknowledge that the side of No 2 is set further from West End Road than many nearby dwellings, but the additional separation is not so large that the space appears anomalous or awkward. In contrast, I find that the tight relationship of the dwelling with the West End Road boundary and limited space to its side would result in an unusual degree of enclosure, and would stand out incongruously against the typically more generous settings that I saw around buildings on this street. Furthermore and irrespective of its orientation, the position of the dwelling so far in front of other dwellings which line this part of West End Road would be highly prominent and intrusive in views along the street scene. I accept that suitable gardens could be provided for both the dwelling and No 2, but I find for these reasons that the development would result in a discordant and jarring feature that would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
7. I note reference by the appellant to potential for an outbuilding to the side of No 2 utilising permitted development rights. However, restrictions on the height of any such development mean that its visual impact and the overall loss of spaciousness would be likely to be much more limited than the proposal before me. The weight that I give to this factor is accordingly limited.
8. Notwithstanding my findings that the appearance of the building would be satisfactory, I find for these reasons that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies 2012, Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP) and Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021). Collectively, these broadly seek high quality design and require, amongst other things, development that makes a positive contribution to the area and that harmonises with its context, including with regard to building lines and setbacks. For the same reasons, the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it seeks high quality design and development that is sympathetic to local character.
9. The Council has additionally referred to Policy DMHD 1 of the DMP, but this relates to alterations and extensions to residential dwellings, and seems to me to be of less relevance here.

Other Matters

10. The proposal for an additional vehicular access to serve No 2 would result in the loss of a section of existing on-street parking bays on Wingfield Way. I note that this would require an amendment to the Traffic Management Order following a process of consultation, and that the Council would need to consider

any objections arising. Given though that I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter in any further detail as it could not alter the outcome of the appeal.

11. The proposal would make effective use of the site to provide an additional self-build dwelling, adding to the supply and mix of housing locally in a moderately accessible location. In this regard, it would accord with the Framework which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing to meet needs, and the LP which sets out targets for the delivery of housing within the borough including on small sites such as this. However, the contribution would be limited by the modest scale of the development for a single dwelling. Moreover, the Framework and LP balance these objectives against requirements that development also delivers well designed places, and I do not find that the limited benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area, nor the resulting conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR