



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2022

by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3277296

84 East Road, West Drayton UB7 9HA

- 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 & Mrs Agrawal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 31005/APP/2020/3975, dated 1 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as, "New Dwelling House".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and whether the proposal makes adequate provision for car parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a 2-storey end-of-terrace dwelling with a large rear garden which is located in a residential area. The local area predominantly consists of a mix of semi-detached and terraced dwellings which are broadly similar in style. A notable characteristic of the area are the gaps commonly found between sets of properties. These gaps are important as they break up the mass of built form and lend an air of spaciousness to the area. I observed that the gap between 84 East Road (No 84) and 86 East Road (No 86) is particularly evident in long views from Blackthorn Avenue, due those dwellings being situated near a bend in the road.
4. Whilst Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part 2¹ relates to alterations and extensions to residential dwellings, rather than new dwellings, and is found under the householder development part of the Local Plan: Part 2, I accept that the proposal would have an acceptable relationship with No 84 as it would be subordinate to No 84 due to its lower ridge line and it would be set-back somewhat from it. Appropriate materials would be used and the proposed dwelling would acceptably follow the boundary line of the site. It would also appropriately have the same eaves level, window proportions and colour as No 84.

¹ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted 2020)

5. Nevertheless, the proposed dwelling would project very close to the existing single-storey side projection at No 86, thereby removing the majority of the pockets of small visual gaps that presently exist between Nos 84 and 86 at ground-floor level. More importantly, although it would not completely erode the existing gap between Nos 84 and 86 at first-floor level, it would subsume a substantial portion of that gap. As such, the proposal would unduly reduce the sense of spaciousness referred to above. Moreover, the proposed hipped roof, with its lower 'link' detail, would appear incongruous in the street scene considering the absence of this feature on many nearby properties. Taking all this into account, the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. I have had regard to full range of examples provided by the appellants. I note that several of these examples relate to 2-storey side extensions, rather than new dwellings, which limits their relevance to the proposal before me. I observed the nearby examples referred to². I note that these examples demonstrate that new dwellings have been constructed on corner plots, thereby filling some of the gap between the adjacent dwellings, and that new dwellings can assimilate into the broader area. However, the gap between Nos 84 and 86 is especially prominent due to the line of sight down Blackthorn Avenue which leads directly to it, meaning that the site is in a particularly sensitive location in this respect. Hence, whilst of some relevance, those examples do not change my findings.
7. I therefore find that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1³ and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Local Plan: Part 2, which collectively provide that, amongst other things, all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations, extensions and the public realm which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area. It would also conflict with Policies D3, D4, D6 and D8 of The London Plan (published 2021) which collectively provide that, amongst other things, development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness.

Car Parking

8. The appellant has highlighted that the 222 bus service stops every 5 to 10 minutes at a bus stop which is within walking distance of the site. However, as minimal details have been provided regarding the availability of other public transport options (such as train services) within the vicinity of the site, I have little substantive evidence to doubt the Council's analysis that the site has a very poor Public Transport Accessibility Levels rating. Moreover, East Road has unrestricted parking in principle but as the site is situated on a bend and East Road and Blackthorn Avenue are not particularly wide roads, parking availability in the vicinity is somewhat restricted in reality. On this basis, it is reasonable to expect the proposal to provide the maximum requirement of 2 spaces per dwelling, as set out in Appendix C of the Local Plan: Part 2. This equates to a requirement for 4 spaces to be provided on site.
9. The proposal seeks to provide 2 off-street parking spaces for No 84 and 2 off-street parking spaces for the proposed new dwelling (one within the proposed

² Including 27A Beech Close, 2A Maxwell Road, 8A Keats Way, 7A Cherry Lane, and 91 Cherry Lane

³ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (adopted 2012)

garage). The first space serving No 84 would be parallel to the road and the second space would be at right angles to the road. This would mean that the first space would not be available for access if a vehicle were to be parked in the second space. The Local Highway Authority has also confirmed that they would not support a dropped kerb for the proposal, for a number of reasons, including that parallel parking to the carriageway should not be permitted. Consequently, on the basis of the evidence before me I am not convinced that the proposal would provide 4 useable spaces.

10. I therefore find that the proposal would not make adequate provision for car parking. It would conflict with Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Local Plan: Part 2 which collectively provide that, amongst other things, development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity.

Other Matters

11. The appellants have engaged in constructive dialogue with the Council, resulting in the revised scheme before me. However, in terms of the planning merits of this appeal, this is a neutral matter, which does not weigh in favour of the proposal. Considering that the site is already in residential use, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would support the development of under-utilised land, and therefore this is also a neutral matter.
12. The proposal would create a new dwelling in an existing residential area. In doing so it would contribute to the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, and the future occupiers of the new dwelling would likely contribute to the local economy, albeit considering that only one new dwelling is proposed the benefits in these respects would be limited. The proposal would be constructed using sustainable materials. It would replace some existing built structures, thereby partially using land that is already built-on. These matters would be in compliance with a number of the Council's development plan policies. However, they would not, either individually or collectively, outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area and the lack of adequate provision for car parking and thus to the conflict with the development plan overall.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR