



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2023

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3306547

4 Court Drive, Uxbridge UB10 0BJ

- 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 Hardev Matharu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 761/APP/2021/1938, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new two bedroom (3 person) dwelling with parking and amenity space and demolishing the existing side extension & garage of the principal dwelling at No 4 court Drive.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is a semi-detached dwelling on the north side of Court Drive with a single storey side extension and garage. The area is residential, with a range of dwelling styles and forms. However, the immediately surrounding dwellings on the north side of Court Drive retain a level of consistency in their semi-detached nature and plot widths. Spacing is present between each pair which, although not of a uniform distance along the street, adds an overall element of spaciousness. As a semi-detached dwelling set back from its immediate neighbour, the site contributes positively to the area.
4. The proposal would demolish the side extension and garage at the site and construct a detached dwelling in materials that would resonate in the local character and with a simple roof form. However, although detached dwellings of various scales are present on the opposite side of the street, the proposal would be sited among the semi-detached properties on the northern side. Rather than having the appearance of a subservient side extension it would clearly read as a separate detached dwelling which, in this immediate group of properties, would appear as an incongruous feature in the streetscape.
5. While the proposal would share an alleyway with No. 4 for access to the rear, it would nevertheless result in the subdivision of the site to house two dwellings, creating two smaller plots. This would not respect the uniformity of plot widths

in immediately surrounding dwellings on this side of Court Drive, failing to reflect the prevailing pattern of development surrounding the site.

6. Due to its positioning, the proposal would infill the gap between Nos. 4 and 6 Court Drive. While it would have a similar footprint to the current garage and side extension, its two-storey nature would be more visually prominent. Although other properties on the street have been extended to the side, reducing the separation distance from neighbouring built form to a greater degree than the proposal, these have retained their semi-detached nature. By contrast, the proposal would introduce a separate, detached dwelling. Combined with the constrained plot dimensions, proximity to No. 4, and the infill of the current gap with No. 6 above ground floor level, this would appear cramped and contrived in context, negatively impacting the overall spaciousness of the immediate streetscene.
7. Concerns have been raised that the proposal would result in excessive hard landscaping. No trees would be impacted and I observed frontage treatments to be varied, with surrounding plots having hard landscaping, including the site. In any event, it is noted in the Officer's Report that concerns could be addressed by a suitably worded condition relating to a landscaping scheme and, based on my observations, I have no reason to disagree.
8. Subject to a suitable worded condition, the proposal would not conflict with Policy DMHB14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies January 2020 (the DMP) insofar as it relates to landscaping and, while Policy DMH4 of the DMP has also been referenced, this relates to residential conversions and redevelopment of dwellings into a block of flats, such that it is not relevant in this case.
9. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above, the proposal would overall result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In this regard, it would fail to comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies November 2012; Policies DMH6, DMHB11 and DHMB12 of the DMP; and Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they seek to ensure good design that harmonises with the local context, maintains local character and takes account of surrounding plot sizes and street patterns.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would provide additional housing in a suitable location in an established residential area. While this benefit of the scheme is acknowledged, given the single dwelling nature of the proposal it carries limited weight, which would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR