



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3253972

Peter James Business Centre, Unit 1 Pump Lane, Hayes UB3 3NT

- 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 Rose against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75062/APP/2020/131, dated 15 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to frontage to increase hardstanding, reduce soft landscaping and include steel railings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to frontage to increase hardstanding, reduce soft landscaping and include steel railings at Peter James Business Centre, Unit 1 Pump Lane, Hayes UB3 3NT in accordance with the terms of the planning application Ref:75062/APP/2020/131, dated 15 January 2020 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan 1:1250, 4289/02 Rev B dated August 2019.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall commence until details of boundary walls, fences or other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before any part of the development is brought into use in accordance with the agreed implementation programme. The completed scheme shall be maintained in accordance with an approved maintenance.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within an established industrial estate with a mixed character. I saw during my site visit that there was a broad range of building types and uses and various site layouts, some with an open, landscaped character and others with a more enclosed industrial appearance.
4. The appeal relates to a site occupied by a two storey red brick building divided into separate business units, it is set back from the road behind a parking court and relatively wide landscaped area retained by a low brick wall. Either side of the appeal property there is two large steel clad industrial buildings. I saw during my site visit that the property to the east is occupied by a timber/building merchant with a large external storage area to the front and side and a relatively tall palisade fence to the perimeter. To the west, I noted a large steel clad building with a large parking area to the front, loading area to the rear and some perimeter landscaping. The two storey building directly opposite the appeal site is set close to the highway behind a low hedge.
5. The appeal proposal would see the reconfiguration of the appeal site to reduce the depth of the landscaping area to the front of the site and replace it with additional hardstanding to allow for additional car parking and the unloading/loading of vehicles. A narrow landscaping strip of around 1 metre would be retained and a palisade fence would be erected on top of the existing perimeter wall. I note that in regard to the perimeter fencing, the Council state that the neighbouring palisade fencing is not characteristic of the area. During my site visit I was able to see several different examples of palisade fencing in the immediate vicinity as well as a range of other boundary treatments including timber fencing, hedges, brick walls and open landscaped areas, amongst others. For this reason and given the very mixed character of the locality I do not consider that the proposed palisade fencing would appear out of keeping or uncharacteristic in the area. Therefore, subject to an appropriate condition relating to the finished details of the fence I am satisfied that the proposed fence would accord with the design requirements of Policy BE 1 of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1-Strategic Policies 2012 (HLP1SP) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2- Development Management Policies 2020 (HLP2DMP).
6. Policy DMHB 11 of the HLP2DMP requires amongst other things that all development to be of the highest design standards whilst taking into account local context and incorporating landscaping and tree planting to enhance the local area. HLP2DMP Policies DMHB 12 and 14 require proposals to retain or include landscaping proposals that are suitable for the location, serve a purpose and enhance the appearance of an area.
7. I accept that the current proposals would reduce the grassed area that acts as a buffer between the highway and the parking area to the front of the appeal building. Nevertheless, the proposal retains some landscaping and proposes includes for the planting of a hedge at the perimeter as well as three landscaped areas to the side returns of the property boundary. In this respect, I am satisfied that the proposal would provide landscaping that would meet the requirements of Policies DMHB 12 and 14 of the HLP2DMP thus retaining character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. I am cognisant of third party comments in relation to the proposed use of the proposed enlarged area of hardstanding to the front of the appeal building and

whether or not it would be used as parking or solely as a space for loading/unloading of vehicles. I am also aware that there is an existing service area to the rear of the building that allows for vehicle loading. However, the plans indicate a demarked parking area that the Council confirm meets the minimum parking bay size of 2400mm x 4800mm plus a rectangular space for loading and unloading. I have not substantive evidence to suggest that the development would not be developed or utilised in this way. I note that the Highways Officer raises no concerns in the regard.

9. The proposed reconfigured parking area would sit in line with the hardstanding areas at both of the adjacent properties and the palisade fencing would continue on from that surrounding the property to the east of the appeal property. Furthermore, the layout and scale of the proposed landscaping area would continue in a similar vein to existing landscaping to the front of the property to the west and would be reflective of the narrow, landscaped area in front of the property opposite. In terms of the wider locality, I am satisfied that the proposal would reflect the mixed character of the surrounding area as described above. As a consequence, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would therefore comply with the relevant development plan policies as set out above.

Conditions

10. The conditions set out in the accompanying schedule are based on those suggested by the Council. In the interests of precision and clarity, and where necessary, I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions and removed those that are repetitive in order to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
11. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.
12. In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition relating to the submission of detailed information on the proposed boundary walls, fences or other means of enclosure.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR