



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3239325

26 Park Road, Hayes UB4 8JN

- 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 & Mrs James Doggrell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 68358/APP/2019/1756, dated 23 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is restoration of hayloft on top of coach house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for restoration of hayloft on top of coach house at 26 Park Road, Hayes UB4 8JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 68358/APP/2019/1756, dated 23 May 2019, 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 drawings: Location Plan, 001000.105.001 & 001000.106.001.
 - (3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed extension to restore the hayloft would create a structure harmful to the character and appearance of the area, by reason of its siting, size, scale and bulk.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey Grade II listed Georgian house built in the 1820s, which is surrounded by twentieth century suburban development. In the north-west corner of the rear garden is an outbuilding built of yellow stock bricks, originally a coach house, which is built into the curtilage boundary walls.
4. This structure has been substantially modified including by the removal of its original first floor and the creation of a flat roof. Other changes to it, including by replacing ground floor 1960s style timber windows and doors with narrower fenestration and repairing the elevations with second hand yellow stock bricks,

have taken place following listed building consent in 2018 (APP/2018/3242) and the more recent listed building consent granted on 25 July 2019 (APP/2019/1757).

5. The proposal in this appeal does not seek to restore the whole of the original height of the first floor of the coach house but simply to provide a reduced head height loft space for storage. The 20° dual pitched roof would be 4.5m high to its ridge as measured from the ground level next to the outbuilding. However, because the coach house building is at a lower ground level, the ridge of the roof would only be about 4m higher than the general level of the flat rear garden itself.
6. The proposed extension would be a maximum of 1.6m to the ridge from the existing roof level. Its detail design has been revised to accord with the Council's Conservation Officer's detailed requirements, as set out on the drawings listed above. The combined works, including the hayloft extension, would help return the outbuilding back into a state resembling its pre-existing condition, which would be more in keeping with the character and significance of the listed dwelling.
7. Paragraph 9.3 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions (the SPD) states that the ridged roofs of outbuildings should not be higher than 4m. Paragraph 9.2 of the SPD says outbuildings should be set in at least 500mm from the boundaries to avoid overshadowing adjoining houses. However, this is clearly impossible for the existing building built adjacent to the boundaries. Besides, it is accepted that the nearest surrounding houses are some distance (15-22m) away from the outbuilding. I was able to verify this on my site visit and I note that there were no objections from any neighbours to the proposal.
8. For these reasons, I disagree with the Council that the proposed first floor extension would result in any harm to the character and appearance of the area, by reason of its siting, size, scale or bulk. There is also no suggestion by the Council that the proposal would affect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
9. Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies and Policies BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Plan: Part 2 – Saved UDP Policies (the LP) together require high quality design including extensions that enhance local character and distinctiveness and would not result in a significant loss of residential amenity. For the above reasons the proposed extension would comply with these LP policies.
10. The emerging Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies is close to adoption. Policies DMHB 2 and DMHB 11 together require outbuildings to be constructed to a high standard of design without compromising the amenity of neighbours, must be proportionate to the footprint of the dwelling house and should be for a purpose incidental to the use of that house. The proposed restoration of the former coach house building would not infringe any of these requirements.
11. Conditions are needed for reasons of precision and in order to preserve and restore the character and appearance of this outbuilding, respectively to require the extension to be erected in accordance with the submitted drawings

and that the elevation of the proposal preserves the significance of the former coach house and the listed building.

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

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR