



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 28 June 2021

by Mr Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3266275

157 Old Station Road, HAYES UB3 4NA

- 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 Hayes Medical Centre against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 32206/APP/2020/2419, dated 3 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension to extend existing doctors surgery.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised elevation plan has been submitted (reference AH 749 06A) that would replace the initially proposed brickwork with render. This would not materially change the substance of the proposal and, in mind of the 'Wheatcroft Principles', would not prejudice any party if I were to take it into account. I shall return to this later in my decision.
3. The appellant also refers to an amended car park plan, however no such plan has been provided to me.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area with particular respect to its effect on nearby trees.

Reasons

5. Old Station Road is a short cul-de-sac. Along this road access is afforded to the appeal site, a day nursery and the residential block of Asa Court. These buildings are opposite an area of green space which contains mature landscaping. The trees within this space create a strong verdant character. The space to the rear of the medical practice includes a car park and grassed area beyond. It is enclosed by several large trees and hedges. The front elevation of the medical centre includes two-storey gables set within a cat-slide roof with half-hipped gable ends. These features add interest to the building. However, its original character has been eroded, to some extent, through additions of various styles and scales to the side and rear. Nevertheless, due to the building's interest and green setting, the site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The general form of the existing building creates a two-storey linear mass that directly addresses Old Station Road. The proposal would be located to the rear of the building. Nevertheless, it would be visible from neighbouring residential properties and partially visible from the highway due to the location of the Asa Court access, adjacent to the site. The rear of the building includes a range of additions of various styles and shapes, including two storey flat roof additions. Although, these are rendered and painted white to address the rear elevation, they have eroded the original character of the building with various forms. As a consequence, the proposed design with revised rendered elevations, would be generally in keeping with the appearance of the building.
7. However, despite the suitability of its design, the proposal would project a significant amount into the rear of the site. As such, the form and scale of the proposal would be at odds with the mass and arrangement of the existing building. Consequently, the proposal would adversely affect the building's linear form and its existing proportions. This would therefore represent a strident and obtrusive addition. As a result, the proposal would harm the appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
8. On site I observed that there is a large sycamore tree adjacent to the north boundary and a large tree (possibly a willow) on the southern boundary. Both of these trees are of a significant size and over-sail the site. Although set back into the site, these make a positive contribution to the local streetscene and the verdant space opposite the site. This is especially with regard to the tree on the southern boundary, which can clearly be seen from the car park access to Asa Court.
9. Policy DMHB 14, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two-Development Management Policies (2020)(LP2), requires all proposed development to retain and enhance existing trees. Criteria 'D' requires that proposals that would affect existing trees will require a tree survey. A tree survey has not been submitted in support of the original application or the appeal. The two large boundary trees would be likely to be affected by the proposed development. The proposed car park extension would be likely to affect the sycamore by excavation works and root compaction. This could be resolved through the imposition of a planning condition, for a specific design of hardstanding, if I were minded to allow the appeal.
10. However, the impact on roots from the proposed extension could compromise the longevity of the tree on the southern boundary and result in its deterioration and loss. This loss would be to the detriment of the character of the area. As such, a tree survey would be necessary prior to the approval of any development. By defining the root protection areas, and with the benefit of an arboricultural method statement, a decision maker could determine whether any harm to the tree could be mitigated. It is insufficient to address this by proposing crown lifting or reduction as this would not address root damage or the full impact of the proposal. As a result, I am unconvinced that the proposal would not result in substantial harm to the tree on the southern boundary.
11. Consequently, taking the above points together, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012)(LP). The proposal would also not satisfy policies DMHB 11 and DMHB14 of the LP2. These policies seek, among

other matters, for development to achieve high quality design that would enhance local distinctiveness and contribute to a sense of place.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would result in the investment and improvement to a well-attended medical facility. Such improvement would be of benefit to the local community, which weighs in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. Despite the importance of improved medical facilities for the general public, this benefit does not outweigh the conflict identified with the development plan. Accordingly, there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Mr Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR