



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/23/3315337

139 Belmont Road, Uxbridge UB8 1QZ

- 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 NARRD Ltd against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 17175/APP/2022/1989, dated 21 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2022.
- The development proposed is the redevelopment of existing two storey dwelling, and the erection of 3 no. dwellings with associated private amenity space, car parking, bike and refuse storage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in an established residential area comprising predominantly detached properties that sit comfortably on their plots and this combined with appropriate spacing between neighbouring properties creates a sense of spaciousness that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. There is an existing one and a half storey dwelling on the site. Although the existing dwelling is located close to the common boundary with No 137 Belmont Road (No 137), it is set away from the boundary with No 141 Belmont Road which allows access to a single storey garage which is set back on the plot. This arrangement creates a sense of spaciousness due to the modest height and the subservient appearance of the single storey garage on the appeal site and the single storey flat roofed garage immediately next to the boundary at No 137. This arrangement complements the prevailing sense of spaciousness evident along Belmont Road and positively contributes to the overall character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would result in the introduction of a block of 3 three-storey terraced dwellings. They would be set in by a small distance from the common boundary on either side. Due to its overall width, limited set in from the common boundaries on both sides and the overall building mass which would extend almost across the entire width of the plot, the proposal would appear unduly cramped on the site, would represent an over intensive form of

development that would not respect the existing pattern of development and would undermine the existing spacious character. As a result, the proposal would appear as a discordant feature that would look harmfully out of place.

6. In reaching that view, I have taken account of the fact that the proposal would be constructed of appropriate materials and would include some design features, such as a hipped roof, which are characteristic of the area. I have also taken account of the fact that a redevelopment scheme was allowed on appeal in 2008 for six flats and the appellant highlights that this proposal reflects that scheme. However, that scheme was not implemented and due to the overall scale of the proposal for the reasons set out above, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, these other considerations do not justify harmful development at the appeal site.
7. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan : Part 1 – Strategic Policies adopted November 2012, Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 : Development Management Policies adopted 16 January 2020 and Policy D3 of the London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021. Among other things, these seek to ensure that development is designed to the highest standards 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 which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would make more efficient use of the appeal site in a suitable location for residential development and would result in an increase in housing stock which would contribute to family sized housing within the Borough. However, these matters are outweighed by the harm the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area.
9. I accept that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highways, parking, access, residential amenity, environmental impact, landscaping and in terms of its impact on trees. However, the lack of harm in relation to these matters does not weigh in favour of the proposal and does not justify harmful development at the appeal site.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made otherwise in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR