



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3278247
25 Friar Road, Hayes UB4 9BZ

- 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 Manjit Singh Jhand against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 21981/APP/2021/249, dated 20 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is Erection of two storey, three-bed, attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space involving single storey rear extension to existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The matter in contention between the two parties is that of the new dwelling and not the single storey rear extension to the host dwelling. I will therefore concentrate my decision based upon the proposed new dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms the private side garden area of No. 25 Friar Road. It is a corner plot and this area of garden is located parallel to the access road into Marian Close, and surrounded by a perimeter wall.
5. The character of the area is made up of predominantly pairs of semi-detached houses. The context of the local area appears as dwellings built in a planned arrangement with a limited number of short rows of three houses, and houses in a longer terrace row seen further along Friar Road.
6. There is some variety to the character of house types within short range of the appeal site. However, a unifying element of the locality is the large side plots of Nos 23 and 25 Friar Road that turns the corner with Marian Close. Both these houses are semi-detached and frame the access into Marian Close.

7. A new dwelling as proposed would encompass most of the side garden area and detrimentally erode the sense of spaciousness that the existing side garden creates. In a built-up area, it provides spatial relief and openness upon transitioning from one residential road into another.
8. The proposed dwelling has been specifically designed to mirror that of the host dwelling. Whilst rows of three houses are not uncommon within the street scene, these are located in a different arrangement to the proposal. In this position, an additional dwelling attached to the appeal dwelling, to create a row of three houses, would detrimentally undermine the symmetry of the opposite pair of semi-detached houses that denote the access into Marian Close. It would appear as a visually prominent and discordant feature within the locality. As a dwelling as proposed, it would not make efficient use of the land.
9. In addition, a new dwelling in this location would project forward of the return building line of No. 2 Marian Close that is located behind the appeal site. Given the close relationship between the two, the proposal would represent an uncharacteristic build pattern to the area. It would appear as a conspicuous and obtrusive form of development seen in the approach from Marian Close towards Friar Road and thus result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Even though it may provide an additional dwelling to housing stock within an area well served by local amenities and public transport, as well as employment opportunities during build phase, and provide acceptable spacing standards, these benefits associated with a single dwelling would be limited. They would not lead me to reach a favourable conclusion on the matter. There is no evidence provided by the appellant as to how the proposal would be considered affordable housing.
11. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposed development would not respect the local built grain but would instead appear as an unsympathetic addition to the street scene, contrary to the design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020.

Conclusion

12. As the proposal would result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the local area, it would thus lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR