



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by **I Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3290644

Carter House, Colham Mill Road, West Drayton, Middlesex UB7 7AE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Purewal against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 2963/APP/2021/2734 is dated 4 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'retrospective single storey front extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at Carter House, Colham Mill Road, West Drayton, Middlesex UB7 7AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2963/APP/2021/2734, dated 4 July 2021, and the plans refs 2021-13CMR-EXT-1 Rev 1.0, 2021-13CMR-EXT-2 Rev 1.0, 2021-13CMR-EXT-3 Rev 1.0, 2021-13CMR-EXT-4 Rev 1.0, 2021-13CMR-EXT-5 Rev 1.0, 2021-13CMR-EXT-6 Rev 1.0 submitted with it.

Procedural matters

2. The proposed development has been carried out and is the same as that which has been applied for. The development is described as a 'retrospective single storey front extension'. However, as the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 describes development as 'the carrying out of building operations' use of the term retrospective is not a valid description. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that the application is for a single storey front extension.
3. At appeal stage the appellant proposed to address any parking concerns by providing parking in accordance with the different arrangement shown in drawing ref 2019-13CMR-1 Rev 1. This plan which formed part of the approved plans in relation to a previous allowed appeal on the site. As revealed in its appeal statement, the Council's case though is that it has no objection to the parking layout that formed part of the application. At my request the appellant has clarified that he therefore wishes that the appeal is determined on the basis of the original parking layout proposed in the application. Accordingly, I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, Carter House, is a flat roofed, two storey building located on Colham Mill Road next to its junction with the busy thoroughfare of Station Road.

6. Colham Mill Road is a residential street characterised by closely spaced, two storey dwellings set back from the pavement behind modest front gardens. In keeping with the homes along the road Carter House is also set back slightly from the pavement. An Inspector dealing with a previous scheme on the site considered Carter House to be at a point of transition between Colham Hill Road and Station Road. However, with open hardstanding separating it from the neighbouring dwellings on the same side of the road and its position hard up against the side wall of the railway bridge on Station Road, it appears to me to be very much part of the Station Road street scene rather than part of the streetscape that defines Colham Mill Road.
7. The front extension in occupying the space between the building and the back edge of the pavement is enclosed by the side wall of the bridge. Nestling within this space its lightweight structure, which extends across two thirds of the width of the building, and expansive use of glazing complements and enhances the street scene and introduces activity to the street. The extension projects slightly beyond the side of Carter House and marginally forward of the end of the side wall of the railway bridge. However, with the dominant presence of the tall railway bridge wall and fence to the rear neither matter materially detracts from the design of the extension. Similarly, as the raised plinth upon which it is built matches the colour of the bridge side wall, and is subservient in scale, this aspect of the extensions design is also acceptable.
8. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the front extension is well designed and complements the host building and surrounding area in compliance with policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMNB 13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two. These policies require the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features.

Other matters

9. Concerns have been expressed that the extension has resulted in an increase in on road parking to the detriment of highway safety. However, the local planning authority does not object to the proposal on these grounds and the enforcement of the parking restrictions that apply on both sides of Colham Mill Road will minimise the likelihood of such parking occurring.
10. The only means of entering and leaving the building is via the two entrance doors within the front elevation. In compliance with the development plan both have level access. As a result, it is unnecessary to attach the condition suggested by the Council requiring the provision of such access.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector