



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2025

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/24/3357807

Land adjacent to 19 Princes Park Close, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 1LB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Jaswant Kooner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 75586/APP/2024/1225.
- The development proposed is construction of a four-bedroom detached house.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the site address and description of development from the decision notice for accuracy.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area, and upon biodiversity.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is largely open land alongside a residential dwelling at the far end of Princes Park Close (the Close), a suburban cul-de-sac. The Close has a formal, planned appearance. This results largely from the symmetry of its layout; four terraces, each of four homes, line the sides of the road in near mirror-image. Beyond this is found four semidetached houses, a pair on each side, also set out in near mirror-image. These are at an angle, facing directly out onto the turning head. All of this is evident immediately upon entering the Close, as is a spacious gap between the appeal site and 22 Princes Park Close (No22), directly in line with the centre of the Close.
5. Many homes in the Close have been altered and personalised; rear dormer roof extensions are visible at the end of some of the terraces, and a two-storey side extension at No22 is particularly noticeable. Even so, these extensions are largely subservient to their host dwelling, such that the symmetrical layout and spacious feel around the turning head remain prominent and beneficial local characteristics.
6. The proposed development is a detached house, set beyond No 19 at the furthest point of the Close. It would, as a consequence of its position relative to the centre

of the road, be visible from all along the Close. It would be sited further back from the road than any of its neighbours and be wider than them. Whereas other homes nearby have windows on both sides of their front elevations, the proposed house would only have them on the left-hand side.

7. In the absence of a counterbalancing development on the opposite side of the Close, the proposed house would significantly and harmfully undermine its existing symmetry and balance. This would be exacerbated by the house being sited in noncompliance with established building lines, by it being the only detached house in the Close, by its locally unique and strikingly unbalanced fenestration arrangement, and by its uncommonly expansive paved forecourt. Each of these would be incongruous in the homogeneous setting, emphasising the presence of the dwelling in the Close.
8. Furthermore, in eroding the exiting gap, the development would damage the current open, spacious feel at the far end of the Close, introducing a cramped, congested feel in its place.
9. Notwithstanding the absence of a street-scene drawing, I have no reason to doubt that the height of the proposed house would accord with its neighbours, as would its external finishes. I recognise that the proposed bay window is based on typical local features. None of these, however, are sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.
10. My attention has been drawn to a development at 27 Princes Park Avenue¹. However, the appellant has not contested the Council's description of the differences between that site and approved development on one hand, and the appeal site and proposed development on the other. I saw for myself that there is not the same degree of symmetry at the far end of the Avenue as in the Close, and that properties at the end of the Avenue are set back from the main building lines and not as prominent as those in the Close. I am satisfied that there are sufficient differences between the two schemes to justify different decisions.
11. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies BE1, DMH6, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012 & 2020) where they require development to enhance local context by responding positively to local distinctiveness and contribute to a sense of place.

Biodiversity

12. The appellant has not supplied any evidence of the existing 'baseline' level of biodiversity at the site and argues that planning conditions could be used to ensure this information were supplied in advance of development. Even if this were so I have no reason to believe that, in changing the appeal site from largely undeveloped land to one hosting a house and hardsurface, the proposed development is capable of delivering the requisite gains. As such, the use of conditions as suggested would be unreasonable.
13. The proposed development would not evidently comply with Policies EM7 and DMEI7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012 & 2020) where they require that biodiversity and geological conservation will be preserved and enhanced, with

¹ Application Ref 75611/APP/2023/2063.

particular attention to improving biodiversity from all development, and that planning decisions be informed by appropriate survey information on ecology.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has suggested that, in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area, planning conditions could be used to alter the siting of the proposed house. That is not an approach I can support; To do so would result in a materially different scheme, which has not been subject to consultation.
15. I recognise that the scheme before me comprises a revised design. However, I have assessed the scheme on its own merits; how it compares to the previous proposal plays no part in my determination.

Planning Balance

16. The proposal would provide one new dwelling towards the Governmental aim of significantly boosting supply and could be built quickly. The supply of new housing carries significant weight but is tempered in this case by the modest scale of the scheme. There would be some temporary economic benefits associated with the construction phase as well as the prospect of work-related training for site operatives. Thereafter, there would be ongoing local economic and social activity relating to the occupation of the site to the benefit of local facilities and services, as well as to the local community.
17. Nevertheless, given the relatively modest scale of the proposal and the small number of new residents brought about, these benefits would be minor, and not sufficient to outweigh the harm resulting from the conflict with the development plan described above.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
19. The appeal is dismissed.

A Knight

INSPECTOR