



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3184582

1 Patching Way, Hayes UB4 9YD

- 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 Alexis Quivet against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72372/APP/2017/1552, dated 28 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "ground floor rear extension and new side glazed corridor to connect garage with garage, including the conversion of this into a playroom".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor rear extension and new side glazed corridor to connect with garage, including the conversion of this into a playroom at 1 Patching Way, Hayes UB4 9YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 72372/APP/2017/1552, dated 28 April 2017, 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: A2100, A2110 and A2120.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. In my decision I have used the description of development as given on the application form as there is no indication in the appeal documentation that the altered description used by the Council was agreed with the appellant. In doing so however I have removed one of the references to "garage" as this appears to be an inaccuracy.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached house on a modern development. It is at the end of a short private drive which serves three dwellings. This small group is screened from view from Glencoe Road by a belt of trees along the frontage of that road. For this reason and because the proposed corridor extension would be set back in views along the drive it would be quite secluded and not prominent in the public realm.
5. Although more prominent from within the group, the extension would be contained between the two buildings which it would link and would thus not be out of context. Neither would it interfere with any view along the frontages of the dwellings as it would be adjacent to the boundary of the group. The glazed design of the extension would minimise its bulk and its position to the side of the house would not significantly alter its general appearance or proportions. For these reasons the proposal would not unbalance the pair of houses or appear unduly intrusive.
6. New windows would be inserted into the garage door opening and would maintain the proportions and general appearance of that building. The Council has no objection to this aspect of the proposal or to the proposed rear extension and I see no reason to disagree.
7. Guidance on specific types of front extension is provided in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement¹ (HDAS) but the proposed corridor does not fall within those specific types. While I recognise the potential for front extensions to result in harm, for the reasons given I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. For these reasons the proposal would accord with policy BE1 of the Local Plan² (LP) and saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan³ (UDP) which require high quality design, that development harmonises with the street scene and with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building and complements the character of the area.

Highway Safety

9. The proposal would result in the loss of a single parking space from within the garage but the plan indicates that two spaces would remain on the drive in front of the garage, this number being in accordance with the Council's car parking standard. The adjoining neighbours similarly have two parking spaces in front of their garage and the detached house off the drive has its own garage and paved forecourt for car parking. The plan indicates that there is a turning area available which extends onto that forecourt. One of the appellant's parked cars may partially obstruct that turning space but this would not preclude its use by him.
10. The extent of the available turning facility for the adjoining property has not been illustrated but it seems to me that adequate space would remain for the neighbours to turn their cars to enable them to exit the drive in forward gear.

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (2008)

² Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012)

³ London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (2007)

It has not been demonstrated that such manoeuvres would be prevented. Indeed the appellant regularly parks two cars in front of the garage at present and this arrangement would not be altered. There is no evidence before me of any existing or potential highway safety hazard that would result from the proposal and no evidence of any objection by the Highway Authority to the proposal.

11. For these reasons the proposal would not result in harm to highway safety. The proposal would accord with saved policies AM7 and AM14 of the UDP which require that development does not prejudice highway and pedestrian safety and that it accords with the car parking standards.

Conditions

12. I have imposed conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for details of materials to be approved to provide certainty and to ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR