
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by Beverley Doward BSc BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253161

19 Jacks Lane, Harefield, UB9 6HE

- 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 Sanjay Jobanputra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75179/APP/2019/3437, dated 18 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear kitchen extension with a pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear kitchen extension with a pitched roof at 19 Jacks Lane, Harefield, UB9 6HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 75179/APP/2019/3437, dated 18 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos 19 JL/P/01, 19 JL/P/02, 19 JL/P/03 Rev A, 19 JL/P/04 Rev A, 19 JL/P/05, 19 JL/P/06 Rev A, 19 JL/P/07 Rev A.
 - 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 in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Black Jacks and Coppermill Lock Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end terraced dwelling which forms part of a modern residential development along the Grand Union Canal in Harefield. The built form of the development is arranged in crescent shaped blocks which vary in their orientation with some properties accessed along the canal frontage and others along Jacks Lane.
4. The appeal site lies within the Black Jacks and Coppermill Lock Conservation Area which extends along the Grand Union Canal. The Conservation Area draws its significance from the canal. The canal, the mix of residential and commercial development alongside it and the canalside structures such as the locks to the

north and south of the appeal site are integral to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

5. The appeal property is sited adjacent to the canal in a sideways orientation. The front of the property faces north towards the jetties. The side elevation faces onto the canal whilst the rear of the property faces south towards the adjacent dwelling at 20 Jacks Lane. The appeal site contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area due to its built form and its location alongside the canal.
6. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a depth of around 3.6m and a width of 4.22m. It would also have a mono-pitched roof to a height of around 3.3m. Accordingly, it would be relatively modest in size and scale.
7. The extension would extend beyond the existing projecting element to the rear of the property with the roof wrapping itself around the projecting element. Whilst there is a uniformity to the built form of the dwellings within the residential development along this part of Jacks Lane the proposed extension would not be seen from the front of the dwelling. Also, as I saw from my site visit, any public views of it from the canal side of the site or from the towpath on the opposite side of the canal would be somewhat limited. In any event, when viewed from these vantage points, the proposed extension would, due to its relatively small size and scale, appear as a subordinate element that would not unduly disrupt the existing plan form of the dwelling or detract from its character or appearance or that of the surrounding area.
8. To conclude therefore, the proposed development would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would preserve the character and appearance of the Black Jacks and Coppermill Lock Conservation Area. It would therefore accord with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (January 2020) which require high quality design and seek to safeguard character and appearance. It would also accord with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, both of which seek to conserve the significance of heritage assets.

Other matters

9. Any noise and disturbance resulting from the construction of the proposed extension would be likely to be limited in extent and temporary in effect. I have not been given any firm evidence to indicate that it would not be possible to construct the development without damaging adjacent properties. Any covenants or other legal restrictions that may exist on the appeal property are civil matters and not ones for the planning system.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard implementation condition a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition requiring materials to match the existing original property is also necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

Beverley Doward

INSPECTOR