The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2020 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Elizabeth Jones BSc (Hons) MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3249084
65 Swanage Waye, Hayes UB4 0NZ

- 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 Goldy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 31181/APP/2019/3797, dated 21 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2020.
- The development proposed is described as, "retrospective planning application for retention of front porch and verandah".

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a porch/canopy to front at 65 Swanage Waye, Hayes UB4 0NZ in accordance with the application, Ref 31181/APP/2019/3797, dated 21 November 2019, subject to the following condition:

1) The development hereby permitted has been carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: XEVA/65SW/101 Issue A, XEVA/65SW/103 Issue A, XEVA/65SW/105 Issue A, Location Plan (1:1250).

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. The description of development given in the Council's decision notice is: "Porch/canopy to front (Retrospective)". This is the description used to determine the application. The description of the development has been amended to reflect both the appeal form and the decision notice which more concisely represent the development as built. However, as 'retrospective' is not an act of development, this text has been removed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terraced house located in a residential area. The porch has been built with bricks and has solid double doors. A canopy is situated above the porch, which is supported by a column. The materials used for the canopy match those used on the roof of the host property. The porch does not extend significantly past the front elevation of the property, and does not extend higher than the windows on the ground floor. Accordingly, whilst the development is noticeable, in my view it is subordinate in scale to the host property, and blends with its architecture.

6. I observed a number of other porches present at properties on Swanage Waye. The main difference between the development at the appeal property and those porches is the addition of the canopy. I also observed all of the examples of other developments which the appellant has referred to[1]. Many of these examples are of a similar or larger scale to that built at the appeal property. Several include front porches with a canopy spread over the entire width of the property. In particular, I observed that the development at No 59 Brookside Road, Hayes was in view from the appeal site, and was quite prominent in the street scene, in part due to its full-width canopy being supported by four columns.

7. The scale of the development at the appeal property is very much in-keeping with those examples. Considering the close proximity of those examples to the appeal site, and the presence of other porches on the street, the development does not appear out-of-keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

8. I therefore conclude that the development has an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal complies with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) which collectively seek to ensure that all new development achieves a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. I have considered the conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. As the development has been carried out I have omitted the standard time limit and materials conditions, as these are no longer necessary. A condition is necessary specifying the approved plans, to provide certainty.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Alex O'Doherty

[1] Including: 22-24 Swanage Waye, Hayes; 47 Swanage Waye, Hayes; 57 Swanage Waye, Hayes; 49 Blandford Waye, Hayes; 61 Blandford Waye, Hayes; 55 Blandford Waye, Hayes; 55A Blandford Waye, Hayes; 57 Blandford Waye, Hayes; 59 Brookside Road, Hayes.

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Jones

INSPECTOR