
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by **Ian Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3290734

11 Carnarvon Drive, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 1PU

- 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 & Mrs Ram against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 35377/APP/2021/3311, dated 31 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing side/rear extension, detached garage and sheds. Application for 1 no. 2-bedroom dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has changed and the following description has been given 'erection of two storey attached dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and widening of existing dropped kerb (following demolition of single storey side extension and outbuilding)'. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of this revised description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Carnarvon Drive is a long, straight residential street characterised by a regular pattern of terraced and semi-detached, two storey houses that are closely spaced. One of the features of the layout of housing along the road that helps to offset the density of built development is the openness that is introduced into the street scene by the positioning of development diagonally across street corners.
5. No 11 is located on the end of a short terrace on the corner of Carnarvon Drive with the return building line at first floor level only marginally forward of the front elevations of neighbouring houses along the Drive to the south. The proposed two storey dwelling attached to the side of No 11 would project significantly further forward of the return building line and close off a notable part of the space to the side of the house at first floor level. In so doing it would disrupt the rhythm of

development and result in a street scene that is materially more enclosed and urban in character.

6. In support of the appeal, reference has been made to a roof space conversion allowed on appeal at 96 Bourne Avenue located on the corner of Clevedon Gardens on the same housing estate. However, as this permission relates to the conversion of a roof on a single storey side extension with a far larger separation distance between it and development to its rear, it is materially different to the proposal before me. As a result, this decision has not altered my findings in relation to the proposed development.
7. Taking all these matters into account, I therefore conclude that the proposed dwelling would constitute poor design that would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies, policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies ('Local Plan:Part Two') and policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan. These policies require the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features.

Conclusion

8. The proposed house would provide adequate internal space and private amenity space provision in compliance with policies DMHB10, DMHB16 and DMHB18 of the Local Plan: Part Two. In relation to parking, highway matters, trees / landscaping and the amenities of neighbours, the proposed scheme would also be compliant with relevant policies of the development plan. However, the demonstrable harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the area would be in conflict with the policies of the development plan listed in paragraph 7. As a result, I find that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan considered as a whole.
9. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector