



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2023

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3318787

1 Adelphi Crescent, Hayes UB4 8LY

- 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 J Sokhi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75616/APP/2022/3256, dated 24 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a detached 2-bedroom, 3-person single family dwelling on land adjacent to 1 Adelphi Crescent including off street parking, cycle storage and storage/recycling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect of the proposal on highway safety; and
 - Whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, with regard to the provision of private amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located within an established residential area comprising predominantly semi-detached properties of a similar period. The appeal property is sited on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Adelphi Crescent and Weymouth Road. The appeal property and its attached neighbour are arranged at an angle facing the centre of the road junction which matches a similar arrangement for the semi-detached pair on the other side of Weymouth Road.
4. The appeal property has a gap between its side elevation and the neighbouring semi-detached property at No 3 Adelphi Crescent (No 3). Its attached neighbour at No 24 Weymouth Road (No 24) has an attached single storey garage to the side. This arrangement creates a sense of spaciousness at this prominent corner plot which makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposal would involve the introduction of a detached dwelling within the existing gap to the side of the appeal property which would erode the existing sense of spaciousness which as I have noted above makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Further, the rear corner of the proposed dwelling would be set in from the common boundary with No 3 by less than a metre. This arrangement, combined with the proposed position of the dwelling on the plot relative to the position of the neighbouring house at No 3 would create a cramped development harmfully at odds with the existing pattern of development.
6. I accept that the overall height, building materials and finish of the proposal would be compatible with surrounding properties and it would not result in a loss of landscape features or impede views and vistas. However, these factors do not justify harmful development at the appeal site.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies adopted November 2012, Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies adopted 16 January 2020 (LP- DMP) and Policy D4 of the London Plan, March 2021 (LP). Among other things, these seek to ensure that development is designed to the highest design standards that delivers high quality place making which enhances and positively responds to the local distinctiveness of the area, harmonises with the local context by taking account of its surroundings and takes account of the established townscape character. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.
8. The Council has cited Policy D8 of the LP which deals with the public realm which as set in the LP itself includes all publicly accessible space between buildings. Given the nature of the proposal this policy is not relevant.

Highway Safety

9. The proposal would have a car parking space to serve the proposed new dwelling and two additional parking spaces to serve the existing dwelling.
10. The appellant has undertaken a parking survey which supports my observations on the site visit that there is not a significant degree of parking pressure in the area. Further the LP encourages car-free and car lite parking provision depending on how well a particular site is connected by public transport and I accept there is no information before me which suggests that any on street parking restrictions are planned within the vicinity. However, the proposal includes parking spaces as an integral component of the proposed development, and consequently it is important that they are suitable and do not result in highway safety concerns.
11. The proposed layout of the car parking spaces to serve the existing dwelling would result in vehicles undertaking several complex manoeuvres to access them which would likely involve some manoeuvring of vehicles across the pavement and onto the road. The space serving the proposed new dwelling would also be able to use two crossovers which would involve vehicles driving across the pavement at two points and at an irregular angle due to the position of the proposed parking space. Overall, I am concerned that the proposed

parking arrangement could result in inconvenience and danger for pedestrians and highway users.

12. I therefore conclude that that the proposal would not provide suitable parking provision and would increase road danger in conflict with LP Policies T4 and T6 which among other things seek to ensure that development proposals should not increase road danger and that parking provision associated with new residential development should be based on maximum parking standards.

Living conditions

13. Due to the orientation of the proposed dwelling on the plot, the proposed garden area to serve the new dwelling would be located to the rear and side of the house with an additional area of front garden. The proposed garden area to serve the existing house would be located to the rear of that property with the front predominantly comprising the parking area.
14. I am satisfied that overall; the proposed development would provide good quality and useable private garden of a size and shape that would be adequate to serve both the proposed new dwelling and the existing house. Further, despite the proximity of the garden areas to No 3 and the street, they would not be unacceptably enclosed.
15. I therefore conclude that the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for the future occupants of the proposed dwelling as the provision of private outdoor garden space would be adequate. Consequently, the proposal complies with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 18 of LP- DMP which seek to ensure development proposals are designed to the highest standards and provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space.

Other Matters

16. I have taken account of the fact that the proposal would provide an additional house in a suitable location which would generate modest economic and social benefits. However, these benefits are clearly outweighed by the unacceptable harm the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area and on highway safety.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the proposal should be determined otherwise in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR