
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3239033

106 Porters Way, West Drayton, UB7 9AD

- 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 Mrs Ayrie Molaahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72945/APP/2019/430, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side/rear extension, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension to allow conversion into 2 x studio flats and 1 x 1-bed self-contained flat, with associated parking and amenity space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side/rear extension, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension to allow conversion into 2 x studio flats and 1 x 1-bed self-contained flat, with associated parking and amenity space at 106 Porters Way, West Drayton, UB7 9AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 72945/APP/2019/430, dated 18 January 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 plans: 0128/PLA/70_A; 0128/PLA/71_B; 0128/PLA/72_B; 0128/PLA/73_B; 0128/PLA/74_B; 0128/PLA/75_A; 0128/PLA/76_A; 0128/PLA/77_A; 0128/PLA/78_A; 0128/PLA/04_A; 0128/PLA/05_A; 0128/PLA/06_A; 0128/PLA/07_A; 0128/PLA/08_A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, unless otherwise specified on the approved plans.
 - 4) No development shall take place above slab level until a scheme of sound insulation between the proposed apartments has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained.
 - 5) The proposed bin stores, cycle stores, and boundary fences shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council adopted a new Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies in January 2020, after its refusal of planning permission. The new Local Plan Part 2 has superseded the saved policies of the previous Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998). In these circumstances, I am required to determine the appeal against the current development plan for the area at the time of my Decision. In addition, the Council has confirmed that it has now withdrawn the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document (2006), which is referred to in the Decision Notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are, firstly, the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, secondly, whether the development would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with regard to access to outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached property on the corner of Porters Way and South Road. It has previously been granted planning permission (Ref 72945/APP/2017/2090) and a Lawful Development Certificate (Ref 72945/APP/2018/378) for similar side and rear extensions to the property. The development differs from those proposals in that it includes an additional 2 storey rear projection and a double width porch to the front elevation.
5. The proposed rear projection would be relatively shallow in depth and would only modestly extend the property beyond the existing rear wall. Its design and roof profile would be in keeping with the host property and it would be constructed in matching brickwork. Whilst the development would be visible in longer views along South Road its scale and appearance would not appear unduly dominant or unsympathetic in my view. The proposed double width porch would also be constructed in matching brickwork and it would have a flat roof profile. Whilst it would be relatively wide, its design would be sympathetic to the host property and it would not be excessive in scale. Cumulatively, the extensions would be appropriate to a larger corner plot such as this, and I do not consider that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site.
6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), which seeks to ensure that new development achieves good design and contributes positively to the local area.

Living conditions

7. The apartments would be served by amenity spaces to the side and rear of the property. These would be of an adequate size given that each of the dwellings would only contain 1 bedroom. The amenity space serving Flat 3 would be positioned along the side of the property next to South Road. South Road is a quiet suburban street and any activity along it would be unlikely to be a significant source of disturbance to users of the garden area. The garden area would also be enclosed by a 1.8 metre close board fence, which would afford it a

sufficient degree of privacy from the road. A similar fence is already positioned along this boundary. In addition, the proposed car parking spaces would be unlikely to generate a significant number of vehicle movements so as to undermine the privacy or enjoyment of the garden spaces.

8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with regard to access to outdoor amenity space. It would therefore accord with the relevant sections of Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020). This policy seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that alterations and extensions to existing dwellings retain adequate garden space.

Other Matters

9. The sub-division of the dwelling into 3 apartments would result in a modest intensification in the occupancy of the property. However, the additional comings and goings would be modest and would be highly unlikely to result in any significant disturbance to neighbours. Each property would also be afforded a dedicated parking space, which is sufficient for dwellings of this size.
10. The proposed driveways would be in a similar position to existing driveways, and any intensification of their use would be limited. Moreover, there is good visibility in both directions from the points of access. I further note that the Highway Authority has not objected to the development on safety grounds.
11. It is asserted that the development could encourage the subdivision of other dwellings in the area. However, the appeal site is a corner property in a significantly larger plot than most of the surrounding houses. The particular circumstances relating to the appeal proposal are therefore unlikely to be replicated elsewhere to any significant extent.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary in the interest of certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match those in the existing building is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area. A further condition relating to sound insulation is necessary to ensure adequate living conditions for future occupiers. Finally, a condition requiring bin stores, cycle stores, and boundary fences to be installed prior to first occupation is necessary to ensure that these are available to future occupiers, and to ensure the privacy of the garden areas.
13. Suggested conditions that would have required the submission and approval of details of screened refuse storage, and secure cycle storage, are unnecessary as these are provided in drawing Ref 0128/PLA/77_A. Similarly, a condition that would have required the submission and approval of a scheme for boundary walls and fences is unnecessary as these details are largely self-explanatory (e.g. 1.8m high close board fences).

Conclusion

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

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR