



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2021

**by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 10 November 2021.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3273702**  
**261 Lansbury Drive, Hayes, UB4 8RU**

- 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 K and Mrs McGarrell against the decision of The London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 57321/APP/2021/463, dated 5 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2021.
  - The development proposed is an outbuilding.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The planning application form describes the development as an outbuilding. This differs from the description given on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice, which describe it as a single storey outbuilding to front for use as an office. Although the latter is a fuller description, the planning application is not incorrect and I see no reason to change it.
3. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. In my opinion, this does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issues.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the streetscene.

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is located in a suburban residential area, which is characterised by semi-detached houses with front and rear gardens. The majority of the front gardens are partially enclosed by low walls and fences and there is little evidence locally of outbuildings positioned in front of the dwellings.
6. The proposal, which is retrospective, is for a single-storey outbuilding, which is located in the front garden of the property, close to the pavement on Lansbury Drive. It is largely screened by a timber fence. The outbuilding is painted white with a GRP finish to the roof and is linked to an existing outbuilding on the site.

7. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 seeks to achieve high-quality design and to conserve and enhance the Borough's environment. In addition, Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (LP2) require new development to be of high-quality design that harmonises with local context and integrates with the surrounding area.
8. Furthermore, Policy DMHD 2 of LP2, states that outbuildings must be of a high standard of design and proportionate to the footprint of the dwelling. I note that the explanatory text states that the Council will strongly resist proposals for outbuildings which are considered to result in an over dominant and visually obtrusive form of development.
9. The above policies are consistent with Paragraph 130 of the Framework, which requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive, and to be sympathetic to local character.
10. The appellants state that the outbuilding is required to facilitate working from home, which has increased during the pandemic and is likely to continue. This includes holding team meetings. I have given this weight in reaching my decision and hybrid/home working now appears to be established in many companies. I also note that the occupants of a neighbouring property have given support to the proposal.
11. Although the outbuilding is largely screened by fencing, it is still visible in the streetscene and it appears incongruous and at odds with the predominant pattern and form of development in the locality, due to a combination of its siting and size. It can be clearly seen from both directions along Lansbury Drive and it is poorly related to the existing properties, because of its position well in advance of existing buildings.
12. Notwithstanding the benefits to the appellants employment, I consider that the proposal has an unacceptably harmful effect on the streetscene and, therefore, it conflicts with the Development Plan Policies and the provisions of the Framework, as referred to above.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

*Ian McHugh*

INSPECTOR