
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3170964
107B Station Road, Hayes UB3 4BX

- 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 Rajinder Pandhar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 71988/APP/2016/2268, dated 10 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a second floor extension to existing first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a second floor extension to existing first floor flat at 107B Station Road, Hayes UB3 4BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 71988/APP/2016/2268, dated 10 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 107B Station Road, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 4BX Location Plan; Proposed Plans Drawing No 107 02
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the following approved plan: Proposed Plans Drawing No 107 02.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is situated more or less in the middle of a parade of brick-faced properties, with commercial uses at ground floor, and residential in the upper floor. The roof level of the parade varies across its length, and the street it addresses slopes upwards towards the railway bridge creating a varied roof profile, that steps up toward a central element containing a staircase to access the terrace's flat roof, with a circular opening on its front elevation. The appeal property is in an intensely urban area, close to Hayes and Harlington station with tall multi-storey buildings in a close relationship with it adding considerable variety to the streetscene.
-

4. The appeal scheme seeks to install a mansard style roof above the appeal property to increase residential accommodation at the site. It would feature dormer windows to the front and rear, and would be set back slightly from its front elevation.
5. The roof level of the appeal property's host terrace varies predominantly between one and two storeys with a three storey central element. However, the varying widths of the different roof levels, combined with the sloping site level of the building mean that it has a far from symmetrical appearance, and has no strong rhythm across its front façade. The proposed development's siting would thus not undermine any strong balance or rhythm within this front aspect, and as a result it would not read as a discordant addition. Moreover, the proposed size and arrangement of the dormer windows would also balance with the fenestration patterns of the elevations immediately below, which would help the appeal scheme to assimilate readily with the architectural composition of its host building.
6. The proposed development would be of a limited width in the context of the parade taken as a whole. Moreover, whilst the appeal scheme would be of a similar height to the parade's central feature, its set-back from the front façade would reduce the proposed development's prominence within the streetscene. As a result, the presence and dominance of the parade's central feature would be substantially maintained. Due to these factors the proposed development would neither read as a bulky nor a disproportionate addition in the context of either its host property or the wider parade.
7. These matters, taken together, lead me to the view that the proposed development would respect the architectural integrity of the building, and consequently would not cause harm to the character and appearance of its surroundings. Accordingly, in these regards I can find no conflict with Policy BE1 of Hillingdon's Local Plan or Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 of Hillingdon's Unitary Development Plan. These policies, amongst other matters, require extensions to existing buildings to maintain the quality of the built environment and harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of their host building and the streetscene more generally.

Conditions

8. I have not been supplied with the wording of any suggested conditions in respect of this appeal. However, I have attached the standard implementation condition to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). In the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition which specifies the approved plans. In order that the proposed development is sensitive to the character and appearance of its host building and the streetscene more generally, I have attached a condition requiring the materials shown on the proposed plan to be used in its facing.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development would not conflict with the development plan insofar as the policies that have been drawn to my attention are concerned. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

G J Fort INSPECTOR