



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: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3250541

20 Airdrie Close, Hayes UB4 9SR

- 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 Mohammed Valijee against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 65637/APP/2019/3860, dated 29 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as, "Single storey side extension to a single family semi-detached house".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed frontage (including the proposed soft landscaping).
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey side extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 20 Airdrie Close, Hayes UB4 9SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 65637/APP/2019/3860, dated 29 November 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Insofar as it relates to the matters approved by this decision, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: VD068/PL03, VD068/PL04, VD068/PL05, VD068/PL06.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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

4. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, Part E of the appeal form states 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: "Single storey side extension". This is the description used to determine the application. The description of development

has been amended to reflect both the appeal form and the decision notice which more accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

5. The Council consider the proposed single storey side extension to be acceptable. Having assessed this matter, I consider that this element of the proposal is acceptable in size and scale and would not result in any adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area, or conflict with the development plan. This element is also clearly severable from the proposed frontage (including the proposed soft landscaping).
6. The main issue in this matter, therefore, is the effect of the proposed frontage (including the proposed soft landscaping) on the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal property is a semi-detached house situated in a cul-de-sac in a residential area. A former detached garage (now an annexe) is connected to the house on this wedge-shaped plot. The property is set-back from the road beyond a garden, a paved pathway, and a tarmac driveway.
8. Whilst a number of front gardens within the Close consist of hardstanding with very little or no landscaping, the majority of properties have pleasant front gardens which in the main comprise grassed areas and planting. The grassed areas and planting make a positive contribution to the street scene and the wider area. As such, despite its small size, the grassed area at the appeal property is important in the context of the Close, as it noticeably adds to the greenery of the local area.
9. The proposal would result in the paving of most of the front garden together with the loss of the existing landscaping. The replacement of the grassed area with hardstanding for a second parking space, would be materially harmful and would negatively impact the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area. Moreover, the proposed soft landscaping, albeit of an equivalent amount to that which currently exists, would mostly be situated behind the two car parking spaces. Therefore, its contribution to the character and appearance of the area would be very limited. The proposed two matching permeable block paved parking spaces and planting would not sufficiently mitigate the identified harm that would be caused by the loss of a considerable proportion of the existing garden area.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed frontage (including the proposed soft landscaping) would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal would conflict with Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) which collectively seek to ensure that development does not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.
11. The proposal would conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which provides that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character. Also, there would be conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), and with Policy BE1 of the

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), which have similar objectives in this regard.

Other Matters

12. The lack of objections from neighbours does not change my conclusion on the main issue in this appeal. The appellant has mentioned that planning permission would not be required for a new or a replacement driveway, due to the use of permeable (or porous) surfacing. However, I am required to consider the scheme as a whole. The appellant has also mentioned that the proposal would improve the drainage capacity at the appeal site, but as limited information has been provided to support this argument, this has been given limited weight.
13. Overall, I find that the matters advanced by the appellant in support of the proposal, do not, either individually or collectively, outweigh the harm identified, nor the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed frontage (including the proposed soft landscaping), and that the appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey side extension.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis a split decision is issued dismissing the proposed frontage (including the proposed soft landscaping), and the appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey side extension.

Elizabeth Jones

INSPECTOR