
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: 4th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3250559

1-3 Gilpin Way, Hayes UB3 5LZ

- 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 A Birk against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72885/APP/2019/3552, dated 22 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of 2 single storey garages to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of 2 single storey garages to rear at 1-3 Gilpin Way, Hayes UB3 5LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 72885/APP/2019/3552, dated 22 October 2019, 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: 900A, 901A, 902A, 903A, 904A and 905A received 18 November 2019.
 - 3) Prior to commencement of the external works hereby permitted, details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the garages hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of the application the Council has adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) (HLPP2). The Council has advised that the Policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012 and the Residential Extensions Hillingdon Design & Access Statement Supplementary Planning Document 2008 have now been withdrawn and replaced by the HLPP2 Policies. I have therefore considered the development against the relevant policies of the HLPP2.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed garages on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms part of the enclosed garden area at the rear of a pair of semi-detached two storey maisonettes located on a corner plot within a mature well-established residential area. A block of single storey garages associated with the adjacent two storey properties is situated along the western boundary of the site served by an accessway running along the rear of the site. A further block of garages is situated to the east on the opposite side of Gilpin Way, making them a common place feature within the streetscene.
5. The proposal would involve the construction of 2 no. single storey garages with a shallow mono-pitched corrugated sheet roof, that would project out from the side of the adjacent block of garages. The proposed garages would be built close to an accessway at the rear of the site and would be set back and separated from the road running along the side of the property by a high boundary wall running along the boundary of the site.
6. Given the site's location, the proposed garages would only be visible over short distances when passing the site and would be seen in the context of the existing block of garages immediately adjacent to the site and those built close to the highway on the opposite side of Gilpin Way.
7. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the single storey garages would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the adjacent and the nearby garages. The overall modest scale and proportions of the proposed garages, set back, together with the use of matching materials, fenestrations and the boundary treatment would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the single storey form of the existing garages. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the existing buildings and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not adversely harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be consistent with the overall design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB11 and DMHD2 of the HLPP2. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals, including residential outbuildings, will be of a high standard of design that harmonise with the local context and make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials.
9. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, 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, I have also imposed a condition requiring details of the external materials of the garages be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the external works.
10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR