



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3286522

61 Gade Close, Hayes UB3 3PY

- 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 H Bakrania against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 52072/APP/2021/3398, dated 7 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side extension at 61 Gade Close, Hayes UB3 3PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 52072/APP/2021/3398, dated 7 September 2021, 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 following approved plans: 21/402/200; 21/402/02; 21/402/03.
 - 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 is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest two-storey, end-terraced house within a planned estate of similar properties. The proposal seeks the conversion and extension of the attached double garage at the side to form additional living accommodation, which has been labelled on the plans as a 'granny annexe'.
4. The design and scale of the extension including complementary materials and fenestration would harmonise with the host property. The limited width, single-storey height, and the set back behind the front elevation, would also render the extension subordinate to the host property and unobtrusive in the street scene. Consequently, the extension would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the host property or wider surrounding area.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposal complies with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies

DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). These require, amongst other things, that all development, including extensions, is designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including harmonising with the local context.

Other Matters

6. Concerns have been raised over the potential adaptation of the 'granny annexe' to form a self-contained residential unit. However, even if the accommodation provided facilities for independent day-to-day living, it would not necessarily become a separate planning unit from the main dwelling. It is notable that the accommodation would not have its own separate access, such that its occupants would have to come and go through the main house. In addition, the close physical relationship is conducive to being able to undertake shared activities and make use of facilities in the main house. In any case, there is no proposal for a separate dwelling before me. If the development is not built or used as proposed, or if there is a material change of use in the future to create a separate dwelling, then a separate grant of planning permission would be required, and the building would be at risk of enforcement action if such permission is not granted.
7. Although the development would result in the loss of garaging, sufficient driveway space would remain to meet the off-street parking needs of the property, and I note the Council has not raised any concern in this regard. Nor has the Council raised any concerns in relation to neighbour impacts, and I saw nothing at my site visit to disagree. There was a suggestion that the loss of garaging could have implications for household storage, but I have no substantive evidence that this would be problematic and could not be accommodated at the property in other appropriate ways if needed. Issues relating to the previous ownership of the garage and Title restrictions, whilst noted, do not have any material bearing on my assessment of the planning issues in this appeal.

Conditions

8. As was suggested in the Council's Appeal Questionnaire, I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR