



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons PG Dip Urban Design MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3264256
18 Moor Park Road, Northwood, HA6 2DN

- 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 Juchau of Smartbuild Homes Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 21577/APP/2020/1792, dated 12 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling with associated parking and crossover onto Grove Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The new London Plan (2021)(LP) has been published since the appeal was made. I shall consider the appeal accordingly. In doing so I am satisfied that no injustice will be caused since the relevant policies which seek to deliver good design are essentially the same as in the previous plan.
3. On my site visit I observed the trees which would need to be felled in order to accommodate the proposed development have been removed, but that peripheral shrubs remain. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The area is characterised by large detached properties within substantial plots, with good size frontages and largely undeveloped rear gardens. Whilst the scale of the proposed dwelling would be in-keeping with other homes in the area, the plot would be substantially smaller than other properties, with a relatively shallow frontage and limited rear garden area. I recognise that the level of proposed private garden space could secure adequate living conditions for future residents. However, a garden of this size would not be consistent with other properties in this area. Whilst I accept that the appeal dwelling would be set away from existing properties, given the limited size of the

proposed plot, the proposal would lead to a cramped form of development which would not reflect the existing development pattern.

6. The proposed dwelling would be accessed off and front onto Grove Road, which runs along the side of the garden of the appeal property. This side of Grove Road is made up of the side boundaries of the appeal dwelling and the property to the rear, No 2 Grove Road. Whilst I note the appellant's view that the proposal could form a bookend for Grove Road when viewed in conjunction with No 1A, the introduction of a lone dwelling in this location would interrupt and be at odds with the existing street pattern. This would cause unacceptable harm to the street scene.
7. A similar dwelling has been constructed on the opposite side of Grove Road in recent years (No 1A). I acknowledge the similarities between that property and the current proposal, in terms of design, scale, the fact that it sits in land which previously formed part of the rear garden of a property on Moor Park Road and that it also has a smaller curtilage than other properties in the area. However, that property sits comfortably within the street scene as it is located at the end of an existing row of dwellings. Therefore, No 1A properly responds to its context and the existing street pattern. On that basis, it is not comparable to the proposal before me. I therefore attach limited weight to this matter in making my decision.
8. I note that the original submission indicated that a number of trees and shrubs would be removed in order to accommodate the development and that the appellant's landscaping scheme proposes mitigation planting. Given that the trees on site have now been removed, the loss of the remaining peripheral shrubs and vegetation on their own would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. In conclusion, whilst I have found the removal of the remaining vegetation on the appeal site to be acceptable, this would not outweigh the overall harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) (HLP1SP), Policies DMH6, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (HLP2DMP), LP Policies D1A and D3 and Paragraphs 122 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), which seek amongst other things to seek to secure good quality development which maintains existing character and responds to local context, in terms of design, scale, building plot sizes, street patterns, streetscape rhythm and landscaping.

Other matters

10. I have considered the information submitted by the appellant in respect of planning consents for dwellings in rear gardens on Hallowell Road. It seems that this area is different in character to the appeal site area in that it includes a higher density of development, with properties and their gardens being generally smaller than in the appeal area. The site circumstances of these developments also vary from the appeal proposal. The bungalow approved to the rear of Nos 37 - 41 Hallowell Road¹ is significantly smaller than the appeal dwelling and also in comparison to the original properties and is not visible

¹ Reference APP/R5510/W/17/3183319

² Reference APP/R5510/W/16/3152126

within the street scene of Hallowell Road. Also, the property approved to the rear of Nos 115 - 117 Hallowell Road² would be viewed in the context of nearby properties on the same side Reginald Road, so reflects the development pattern of that area. Notwithstanding this, each proposal must be considered on its own merit. Therefore, I attach limited weight to these examples in making my decision.

11. In reaching my decision, I have also considered a number of matters raised by the appellant in support of the appeal. I acknowledge that paragraph 122 of the Framework promotes the efficient use of land, however the benefits of securing one additional dwelling would only carry moderate weight. I acknowledge the positive aspects of the scheme, including that the property would provide meet highways requirements, would exceed minimum space standards, that this would be an accessible home and it would not harm the living conditions of existing residents. However, none of these matters would outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan that I have described.

Conclusion

12. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference APP/R5510/W/17/3183319

² Reference APP/R5510/W/16/3152126