

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

**by S Jones MA DipLP**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 15 September 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3174798**  
**95 Nield Road, Hayes UB3 1SQ**

- 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 Gred Grewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 66043/APP/2016/4346, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2017.
  - The development proposed is retention of existing porch and canopy to front elevation.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a porch and canopy to the front elevation at 95 Nield Road, Hayes UB3 1SQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 66043/APP/2016/4346, dated 30 November 2016, and the plans submitted with it.

## Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development used in the heading above has been taken from the application form. However in allowing the appeal I have amended it to delete reference to retention of the existing because this is not development.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

### *Character and Appearance*

4. The property is one of a pair of two storey semi-detached houses with attached single garages on a suburban road not far from the town centre, in an area characterised by dwellings of a similar size and style. It has a single storey side extension.
5. Some dwellings nearby do have a canopy projection over the front porch, and others have an inbuilt open porch to the front entrance, others have enclosed the porch area. I noted that many of the properties in the area have various alterations to the canopies and porches occurring over time. The porch and pillared canopy at this property are a different design to the original features, but brickbuilt and similar to other porches and canopies in the road and the area.

6. The development runs across the porch and extension and has a limited scale, particularly as the canopy cuts away the left corner part of the porch, leaving it open. The remainder is more or less level to the existing frontage given that the two storey bay windows project in front already, and at my site visit I did not find any difference between the porch and the bay window projection to be significant. These large bay windows remain the main feature of the property and the porch does not detract from that.
7. It alters the original appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses, but some changes had already been made at No 95 in terms of the side development. Although the counterpart semi-detached dwelling does not have an extended porch, I consider that this development is not harmful to it because it does not appear incongruous in this suburban area. Overall I consider it is not a harmful feature in the streetscene because it is not out of keeping with the character and appearance of the locality.
8. Therefore I conclude the development complies with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One-Strategic Policies 2012 which requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment enhancing local distinctiveness and a sense of place. It does not conflict with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two-UDP Saved Policies 2012 because it harmonises with the existing streetscene in scale, form, composition and proportions, and complements the character of the area. Although it does not comply completely with all the guidance in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions 2008 HDAS, I am satisfied that it does not result in development that would detract from the character of the street. Policies in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two are saved, but I consider that they are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Other Matters**

9. The Council states that the planning history of other alterations on the area is unknown and not necessarily the result of planning permission. However, I have to take account of the character and appearance of the area as I find it, and I have concluded that this development is not harmful given the above factors.

### **Conclusion**

10. No matters have been found to outweigh the identified lack of harm and policy compliance. Accordingly and for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*S Jones*

INSPECTOR