
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2019

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3227160
56 The Drive, Ickenham, UB10 8AG

- 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 Makkar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 4496/APP/2019/521, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling situated on the eastern side of The Drive, close to the junction with Highfield Drive. At the time of my visit, the site was enclosed by hoarding, although I was able to see that the main dwelling appeared externally to be largely complete including the roof and windows. There are a range of properties of differing designs along The Drive, although they are generally set on consistent building lines behind front gardens and driveways. The setback of properties and the presence of lawned areas, trees and vegetation gives the area a spacious and verdant character.
4. The proposal seeks a detached garage to the front of the property, which would be situated close to the boundary with No. 58. It would have a flat roof form and be constructed of materials to match the main dwelling. The Appellant has made reference to its roof design and the height of 2.6m, which I acknowledge is lower than similar developments which have pitched roofs. Nevertheless, given the floor area of the proposal at over 30sqm, the garage would appear as a large, bulky structure.
5. The proposal would have a limited width compared to the overall frontage of the site, but it would be sited close to the front of the plot. I was able to see the vegetation along the boundary between No's 56 and 58 which the garage would be seen against and which would limit views of the proposed structure from the north. Reference has also been made to a landscaping scheme to the front boundary which is said will be implemented as part of the approved

development. I haven't, however, been provided with the details of this scheme and from my observations of other properties, the presence of vegetation only partly shielded views of front gardens areas, which were still visible, including through openings providing vehicle access. Whilst the garage would be smaller than the host building, and I do not consider it would compete visually with the main dwelling, its scale and siting would result in it having an incongruous appearance in the streetscene. I have taken into account the finished appearance of the garage arising from the choice of materials and detailed design such as the incorporation of stone parapet, but this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

6. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies and BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies which seek, amongst other matters, developments that complement or improve the character of the area. It would also be contrary to the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement 'Residential Extensions', which seeks to ensure high quality design through consideration of the bulk and location of outbuildings and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. Although reference has been to an appeal decision for a smaller single garage at No. 46 The Drive, I have been provided with very limited details of this case and nor have I been made aware of the circumstances of other detached garages in the area. I have in any event, considered this appeal on its individual matters.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR