
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3257041

19 Grange Road, Hayes UB3 2RP

- 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 Shakil Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 48116/APP/2020/501, dated 14 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension to link existing garage to main house, porch to front and conversion of garage to storage and 2 rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension to link existing garage to main house, porch to front and conversion of garage to storage and 2 rooflights at 19 Grange Road, Hayes UB3 2RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 48116/APP/2020/501, dated 14 February 2020, 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 approved plans: 1:1250 Location Plan, GRANGE01, GRANGE02, GRANGE03 Rev. A and GRANGE04 Rev. A received 14/02/20.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the details on the proposed plans hereby permitted, the timber door on the front elevation of the garage shall be retained.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the details on the proposed plans hereby permitted, the rooflights on the garage shall be flush with the roofline and shall not protrude beyond the plane of the slope of the original roof. The rooflights shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Procedural Matter

2. The submitted plan (ref.no. GRANGE02) shows a high level window on the front elevation of the existing garage at the front of the site. However, I observed during my site visit that the original timber door on the front elevation of the garage was still in place. This is acknowledged in the appellant's statement and I have determined the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including the Hayes Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property at No. 19 Grange Road (No. 19) is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey side and rear extension and a detached garage at the front. It is located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. A number of the dwellings have front porches of varying style and designs and single storey side extensions that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the main house.
5. The proposal involves the construction of a single storey front infill extension with a pitched tiled roof to link the existing garage to the main house and a front porch with a mono-pitched tiled roof. The proposed front extension would be built up to the common shared side boundary with the adjacent property at No.17 and would be separated from the adjacent property by a high hedge and wall running between the properties. The adjacent detached two storey property at No. 17 is also set forward in front of No. 19 due to the staggered built form along Grange Road. The proposal would also involve the conversion of the existing garage to storage and insertion of two new rooflights.
6. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the front extension and porch would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Given the site's location, the proposed front extension and porch would only be visible over short distances when passing the site and would be largely screened by the existing garage at the front, the adjacent property and the boundary treatment at the side. It would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles of the existing garage and extensions at the appeal property and the surrounding properties.
7. I do, however, consider that the proposed removal of the existing garage door and insertion of high level windows on the front elevation of the existing garage would have a negative material impact on the area and the Hayes Village Conservation Area (CA). However, the appellant has indicated a willingness to retain the existing garage door which I consider would address this issue subject to an appropriate planning condition.
8. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed front extension and porch would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property. The overall modest scale and proportions of the proposed extension and porch, set back, together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
9. Given the location of the appeal property within the CA, special attention has to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. I consider that the appeal scheme, by virtue of its

scale, siting and design, would have a neutral material impact and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, subject to appropriate planning conditions.

10. I have considered the Council's argument's that the granting of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar developments. However, each application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits, and a generalised concern of this nature does not justify withholding permission on these grounds.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the development would not adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including the Hayes Village Conservation Area. It would be consistent with the overall design and conservation aims of Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012, Policies DMHB1, DMHB4, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals for extensions or alterations of buildings will be of a high standard of design in relation to the property to be extended and the character of the surrounding area; and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation areas.
12. In addition, the proposal would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 124) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 127) and the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets (paragraph 192).

Conditions

13. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council and the appellant. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area and the CA, I have also imposed conditions relating to the existing garage door, roof lights and the external finish of the development.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR