



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2023

by L Francis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3314637

1 Cheddar Waye, Hayes, Hillingdon UB4 0DZ

- 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 A Saroe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 76544/APP/2022/1451, dated 5 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2022.
- The development proposed is the erection of a new attached dwelling, single storey rear extension to both existing and new dwellings and creation of vehicular crossover.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2023, during the consideration of the appeal. The Council and the appellant were given the opportunity to comment upon the revisions insofar as they relate to the appeal.
3. The Council and appellant's comments were also invited on the effect of the proposed cycle and refuse storage arrangements upon the living conditions of future occupiers. I have taken any comments into account in determining this appeal and this is reflected in my setting out of the main issues below.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers with particular regard to cycle and refuse storage and outdoor amenity space.
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
- The effect of the proposed car parking and cycle storage arrangements on highway safety.

Reasons

Living conditions for future occupiers

5. Policy DHMB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012 (HLP 2012) states, amongst other things, that new buildings will be required to harmonise with the local context by taking into account the surrounding plot sizes, widths and coverage. I note that although the rear garden to the host

property would be below the 60 square metre requirement of Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies 2020 (HLP 2020), it would still provide a functional garden space and would be commensurate with the plot widths, size and proportion of rear gardens along this side of Cheddar Waye; on balance it would be an acceptable standard.

6. Notwithstanding the disputed figures for the garden area to the proposed house, the combined rear, side and front garden areas would provide satisfactory outdoor amenity space and would provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers and as such is appropriate in the context of Policies DHMB 11 and DHMB 18 of the HLP 2020. The absence of harm in this respect holds neutral weight in my consideration of the appeal.
7. The cycle and refuse storage shown in the rear garden of the host property would only be accessible either through the house itself or via the driveway of the proposed house. Given that the driveway of the proposed house may ultimately be in different ownership, access across the driveway would not be guaranteed. Even if independent access were possible, there would be very little space to wheel a bike or a bin out to the public highway should a car be parked, due to the very constrained width of the driveway.
8. Based on the parking layout proposed for the host property, there is no evidence before me to suggest that there would be sufficient space to allow cycle and refuse storage to the front as a safer, more accessible alternative. This is due to the proposal showing that the car parking would occupy almost the entire hardstanding to the front of the house, leaving negligible space to dedicate to any storage. The appellant has offered their agreement to a condition requiring the relocation of the cycle and refuse storage to the front. However, I do not find that it would be reasonable to attach a condition requiring details of alternative cycle and refuse storage provision since this would likely require substantive changes to the proposed parking arrangements and layout, and that is not the scheme before me.
9. On the basis of the evidence provided, therefore, the cycle and refuse storage for the host property would harm the living conditions of future occupiers as it would be difficult or inconvenient to access due to its position within the rear garden. This would run contrary to the requirements of London Plan Policy D6 which aims to achieve high quality residential design, along with London Plan Policy T5 which sets standards for cycle parking and seeks to achieve safe, secure and accessible cycle storage.

Character and appearance

10. The area is characterised by 2 storey terraced houses with hipped roofs to the ends of the terraces. The appeal site is located at the end of a terrace of 6 houses. It is set in a corner plot which appears very spacious for the area, with a front, side and rear garden. Separating the terraces are wide paths which appear to provide access to garages or outbuildings to the rear, though these are mostly gated. These gaps contribute to a sense of openness in a relatively densely developed area.
11. Corner plots are typically wider than others in the street, though I note that in the vicinity of the appeal site, the majority of similar houses on corner sites have some form of built development to the side. On Cheddar Waye, the corner plot immediately opposite the appeal site has been developed in a similar

manner to the appeal proposal, and No. 22 at the other end of the street has a side extension extending almost to the boundary.

12. Whilst I appreciate the Council's concern that the proposed house would interrupt the established building line on Bedford Avenue, I do not consider that the building line is sufficiently strong or uninterrupted so as to define the character of that part of the street. The house at 2 Cheddar Waye and its rear outbuilding already extend beyond the building line to Bedford Avenue. The proposed house would primarily relate to other houses on Cheddar Waye rather than those on Bedford Avenue, and the proposal would reflect the form of the house opposite at 2 Cheddar Waye.
13. Given the examples of other extensions and garden development within the vicinity, I do not consider that the proposed house would unacceptably erode the contribution of the existing plot to the character of the area. A sense of openness would be maintained through the paths, townscape gaps and gardens punctuating the built development in the area, and the proposed house itself would still be set back from the side boundary. The proposed house and single storey rear extension to the existing property would fit appropriately with the appearance of the rest of the terrace in terms of scale, use of materials and style and detailing of fenestration.
14. The provision of hardstanding to the front of the existing dwelling would result in the loss of the small front lawn. The presence of soft landscaping to the front of dwellings in the vicinity provides a limited contribution to the character and appearance of the area. I noted on my site visit that very few houses on Cheddar Waye have significant soft landscaping to the front. Although the quantum of hard landscaping to the street would increase, the proposed house would retain soft landscaping to the front, side and rear. The provision of hardstanding in front of the existing house would have a negligible effect upon the character and appearance of the area.
15. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area and that it would be in line with Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan, Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14 and DMHD 1 of the HLP 2020 and Policy BE1 of the HLP 2012. These policies, amongst other things, aim to deliver good design and ensure new development harmonises with the local context, secures well designed public realm and the retention or enhancement of existing landscaping. The proposal would also be in line with the design principles set out in the Framework. The absence of harm in this respect holds neutral weight in my consideration of the appeal.

Highway safety

16. The area has poor public transport accessibility with a PTAL rating of 1b, indicating that there may be a higher dependency on private cars in this location. The proposals contain off street parking for both houses. The quantum and dimensions of the off-street parking would be in line with the expectations of Policy DMT 6 of the HLP 2020 and Policy T6 of the London Plan which amongst other things, set out standards for residential parking.
17. The cycle storage to the proposed house would be contained within the rear garden adjacent to the off-street parking and would be readily accessible for future occupiers of the house. Whilst the rear garden cycle storage for the host property, as I have set out above, would not be accessible or practical, I do not

consider that the arrangement would cause undue harm to the safety of highway users contrary to Policy DMT6 of the HLP 2020. The absence of harm in terms of highway safety holds neutral weight in my consideration of the appeal.

Planning balance

18. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would have economic benefits in the form of construction employment, subsequent maintenance and the use of local services by future residents. The dwelling would contribute to the Council's housing stock and is in a sustainable location. However, given the development comprises only a single additional dwelling, the benefits described above are very small scale and the harm I have identified to the living conditions of future occupiers of the host property in terms of access to safe and convenient cycle and refuse storage outweighs these benefits.

Conclusion

19. I have found that the appeal proposal would not provide convenient or accessible cycle and refuse storage for the host property and would consequently harm the living conditions of future occupiers. As such it is contrary to the development plan read as a whole. The material considerations in this case do not indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

L Francis

INSPECTOR