



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/R5510/W/25/3361737

43 Princes Park Lane, Hayes UB3 1JU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr. S. Kalyan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application reference is 34778/APP/2024/2352.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The first main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surroundings.
3. In connection with that, it is necessary to have regard to the adequacy of proposed garden spaces for future occupiers, in the context of planning policies for the area.
4. The next issue is whether the scheme would provide safe and acceptable car parking provision.
5. Finally, it is necessary to consider whether the scheme would produce an appropriate biodiversity net gain.

Reasons

6. Princes Park Lane is located in a residential area of Hayes and is characterised by semi-detached houses along both frontages in a conventional layout. Many of the front gardens have been surfaced to provide private off street parking spaces and the streetscene is rather “hard” in appearance, relieved to some extent by trees in the highway footpaths. Many houses have also been extended or adapted over the years. Overall, the location provides a pleasant suburban environment.
7. Number 43 Princes Park Lane is sited at the junction with Princes Park Parade and the plot is much wider than others along the road frontages. The existing house is a semi-detached house, linked to number 41, in a traditional form. It is constructed with rendered elevations under a tiled roof, but a large single storey side and rear extension has been added to the original building, of brickwork with a shallower pitched roof. The extension provides the house with a larger kitchen and extra living spaces on the ground floor.

8. An additional dwelling (number 1A Princes Park Parade) has been constructed on the rear part of the original gardens at numbers 41 and 43 Princes Park Lane, greatly reducing the depth of those gardens by comparison with other houses along this section of Princes Park Lane. The corner plot at number 43 remains accessible from both roads, although the access points are close to the intersection of the roads.
9. It is now proposed to demolish the side part of the extended building at number 43, and to construct a new two-bedroom house on the resulting space, thus creating a short terrace of three houses.

Character and appearance and garden land

10. The 'National Planning Policy Framework' emphasises the importance of achieving sustainable design and points out the status of Development Plan Policies, which is established in the primary legislation. Applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
11. The 'National Planning Policy Framework' also emphasises the aim of "achieving well designed places" in the broadest sense (notably at Section 12), while making effective use of land and encouraging economic activity. It is aimed at achieving good design standards generally, by adding to the overall quality of the area and being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, although it is also recognised that appropriate change may include increased densities. The achievement of good design includes protecting existing residential amenities and providing good standards of accommodation in new development.
12. Policies in the Development Plan reflect these general planning principles, notably Policies in 'The London Plan' (dated March 2021), and in the 'Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies' (adopted in November 2012) and the 'London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies' (adopted in January 2020). Policies D3 and D4 of 'The London Plan' stress the importance of good design in new development, while attention has been drawn to Policies BE1, DMHB 11, DMHB 16 and DMHB 18 in the Local Plan, which address design issues.
13. The loss of the existing side extension would not harm the character or appearance of the host building and its surroundings, especially bearing mind the fact that it is a later addition to the building. The new dwelling would introduce a two-storey bulk close to the side road, in place of the existing single-storey structure, but the new construction would be set back from the side frontage, leaving a significant space alongside the side boundary. It would increase the asymmetry of the existing building but, nevertheless, it would be broadly in keeping with the two-storey elevations along the road frontages. The reduction in openness at the corner would not be harmful to the streetscene, in my view.
14. The new house and the existing house at number 43 would have the benefit of relatively small back gardens that would be smaller than others in the surrounding area. The retained gardens would fail to provide an adequate external amenity space for future occupiers of the houses and would be discordant in this location. Hence, I am persuaded that the creation of separate new dwelling would undermine the character of the local area, contrary to Development Plan Policies.

15. In short, I am convinced that the proposed development would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surroundings, as well as providing inadequate garden space for future residents.

Traffic and parking considerations

16. The appeal site location at the junction of Princes Park Lane and Princes Park Parade also gives rise to concerns in relation to the proposed front gardens, however. Like others in the road, the frontage would be largely surfaced, to provide parking spaces for both the existing house at number 43 and the new house on the corner of the site. Access for both spaces would be taken from the existing crossover or a modified version of it.
17. Under the broad heading “Promoting sustainable transport”, Section 9 of the revised ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ deals with a number of transport related issues. It points out the need to address concerns about the transport network and to prevent significant impacts on highway safety. Policies T4 and T6 of the ‘The London Plan’ are, likewise, concerned with various transport issues. Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the ‘Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two’ are also concerned with traffic and transport considerations, including the need to provide “safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network”.
18. In this case, the proposed on-site parking provision would be clearly unsatisfactory. Access to the parking space allocated to the new house would be awkwardly laid out, close to the junction between two residential roads and at an angle to the highway. A car being parked in front of the new house would cross in front of the main entrance to the existing house, while the layout of the footpath crossing would be unsafe, due to the likely amount of manoeuvring that would be needed.
19. Hence, the layout would be unacceptable in itself, because of the effect on highway safety and efficiency, and the proposals would be very likely to give rise to further on-street parking. For this reason, too, I am convinced that the scheme ought not to be allowed.

Bio-diversity considerations

20. The ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ provides that “planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment” and Policies in the Development Plan identify the same considerations, notably Policy DMEI 7 of the Local Plan, which addresses the need for “Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement”. Attention has also been drawn to the relevant primary legislation.
21. The appeal site appears to have limited biodiversity value at present, although it could no doubt be improved. That would require specific proposals, of course, which are not included with the planning application and appeal. The need for further detail is acknowledged by the Appellant and it is argued that this could be achieved by the imposition of a suitable condition. The local planning authority have suggested such a condition as part of their submissions, which would have required the preparation and implementation of an appropriate “Habitat Management Plan” for the site.
22. I share the opinion that this issue could have been capable of resolution, if there had been no other planning objections to the proposed development, and I accept

that the scheme could have produced an appropriate biodiversity net gain, in compliance with a condition, in the event of planning permission being granted. In this appeal, however, other objections to the proposals have proved decisive and the imposition of conditions does not arise.

Conclusions

23. Evidently, the appeal site lies within an established urban area, which is “sustainable” in planning terms, while the contribution that the appeal scheme would make to economic activity and the additional residential unit that would be created both weigh in favour of the appeal.
24. I have concluded that the proposed two-storey construction, in itself, would not have a harmful effect on the streetscene but I have also concluded that the proposed garden layout would be inadequate for residents and harmful to the character and appearance of the surroundings. I am also convinced that the proposed new house would fail to achieve safe and acceptable car parking provision and that the vehicular access to the site would be unsatisfactory.
25. On the other hand, I am persuaded that the need to produce an appropriate biodiversity net gain could have been satisfied, although the planning objections to the project make it unnecessary to resolve this issue in detail.
26. In short, however, the objections to the proposals clearly outweigh the benefits of the project and I have concluded that the scheme before me would conflict with both national and local planning policies (including the Development Plan) and that it ought not to be allowed. Although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.

Roger C. Shrimplin

INSPECTOR