

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by **R J Maile BSc FRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3168378

55 Blandford Waye, Hayes, Middlesex, UB4 0PA.

- 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 P Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application ref: 14053/APP/2016/3765, dated 11 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as: "Retrospective consent for retention of front porch with canopy."
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of the development in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form and includes words that are not acts of development. I have amended the description of the development in my formal decision below to reflect this fact.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front porch with canopy at 55 Blandford Waye, Hayes, Middlesex, UB4 0PA, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 14053/APP/2016/3765, dated 11 October 2016, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the front porch and canopy on the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 55 Blandford Waye forms one of a pair of inter-war, semi-detached houses in a mixed residential area that includes semi-detached, terraced and detached dwellings. The property is not within a designated Conservation Area or Area of Special Residential Character. Nevertheless, given its siting on a corner plot it is necessary for me to have regard to the impact of the development upon the appearance of the street scene.
-

5. The front porch and canopy had been completed prior to the application made to the Local Planning Authority. The works comprise a single structure that spans the entire front elevation of the dwelling. It is constructed of appropriate materials and replaces a lean-to porch to the entrance doorway and a small flat roof to the bay of the living room, being subordinate in terms of its overall appearance to the front elevation of the dwelling.
6. I acknowledge that the porch and canopy unbalance the pair of houses of which no. 55 forms part. Nevertheless, both of the dwellings are set well back from the road and are to some extent screened by low brick walls and hedges. Moreover there are several other houses nearby, both semi-detached and terraced dwellings, which have full width or partial width structures similar to that now before me. It is also relevant that the adjacent house at no. 53 (the other half of the pair) possesses a large porch with lean-to roof, which would not appear to be the original.
7. On balance, therefore, I find upon the main issue that the new structure has a satisfactory relationship with and is not harmful to the character or appearance of the host building or that of the surrounding area as required by Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1¹ and "saved" Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Local Plan Part 2².

Other Matters

8. I have carefully noted the relationship of the front porch and canopy to the living room bay window of 53 Blandford Way to the northwest.
9. Having regard to the modest height and depth of the new structure and that its most adjacent elevation to no. 53 is open-sided, I have concluded that it would not unduly impact upon the residential amenity of the occupiers of that neighbouring dwelling. In this regard, I noted that the principal window of the front living room bay serving no. 53 faces the street, with only the very small flank window of the bay facing towards the open side of the porch and canopy at an oblique angle.

Conditions

10. The porch and canopy have already been constructed. As such, no conditions are appropriate in this case.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

¹ The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (November 2012).

² The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).