
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2015

by Paul Singleton BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8 October 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/15/3065776

22 Deane Avenue, South Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 6SR

- 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 Crown Lodge Developments Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 70505/APP/2014/4406, dated 13 December 2014, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2015.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with a new build block of 4 no. 2 bedroom flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed ground floor flats having regard to overlooking, noise and disturbance.

Reasons

3. The proposed building would be significantly larger in footprint than the existing bungalow, covering a much greater proportion of the site and extending across most of the site frontage. Although similar in width to the bungalow and attached garage together, the proposal would be of significantly greater scale and bulk and its roof would be much higher than its neighbours and the other 2 storey dwellings in the street. The proposed building would result in a cramped development and would be over dominant and overbearing both within the site itself and in the street scene. It would leave only a minimal gap between the new building and number 20 Deane Avenue and the loss of this visual break between properties, the presence of which forms part of the character of the street, would interrupt the rhythm of the street scene.
4. The removal of the boundary wall and vegetation within the front garden and its replacement with hard surfaced parking would adversely affect the character and appearance of the street. The front gardens of a number of nearby properties have been surfaced for parking, although in many cases this has not involved the total loss of boundary walls/fences or garden vegetation, but I do

not consider that these should set any precedent. In my view the extent of hard surface and new vehicle crossover proposed, together with the lack of any opportunity for meaningful new landscaping on this frontage, would result in significant harm to the street scene.

5. For the above reasons I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area and would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts, which together seek to secure new development of a good standard of design which maintains the quality of the built environment and makes a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form and scale.
6. A shared cycle and bin store is proposed within the rear garden area which is to be used as a communal amenity space for the occupiers of the 4 flats. Given the location of the bedrooms to the ground floor flats these arrangements would give rise to a loss of privacy to the occupiers of those properties and some degree of noise and disturbance on a regular basis. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have adverse effects on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the ground floor accommodation and would conflict with Policies BE19, BE21 and BE24 of Part Two of the Hillingdon Local Plan which seek to ensure the privacy and amenity of residential occupiers.

Other matters

7. In its fourth reason for refusal the Council refers to Lifetime Homes standards. These standards have now been replaced by National Technical Standards. However, in view of my findings on the main issues, this is not a determining factor in my decision.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters raised by the parties I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Singleton

INSPECTOR