



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2018

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3198350

38 Frays Avenue, West Drayton, Middlesex, UB7 7AG

- 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 Jalil Reza against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 58891/APP/2017/4188, dated 23 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2018.
 - The development is described as retrospective application for planning permission to retain the recently built canopy and 2 posts, sheltering the front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to retain the recently built canopy and 2 posts at 38 Frays Avenue, West Drayton, Middlesex, UB7 7AG in accordance with the terms of application Ref 58891/APP/2017/4188, dated 23 November 2017, subject to the following condition:

The canopy hereby permitted shall not be modified in any manner without the Council's prior written consent.

Preliminary matter

2. As the description of the development suggests, the canopy has been built and the appellant, in effect, wishes to retain it. I shall proceed on this basis.

Main issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies within the designated Garden City West Drayton Area of Special Local Character (ASLC), although no explanatory information has been provided to explain the basis for the designation. The ASCL's title, however, provides a clue and I saw that Frays Avenue formed part of a pleasant residential area of fairly low density laid out in a semi-formal manner. Frays Avenue itself is a leafy cul-de-sac displaying a wide variety of house types and, as the Council acknowledges, many of these houses display front protrusions of one type or another, including porches.
 5. I have carefully noted the design comments made in the officer report and the views of the Council's Conservation and Urban Design officer. To my mind,
-

however, the expressed concerns as to the impact of the canopy on the host property and its surroundings have been exaggerated.

6. The canopy may not accord with some of the rather prescriptive guidance on such structures in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document entitled Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (HDAS), but I found the canopy to be a simple, well-designed contemporary structure contrasting tastefully and acceptably with the appearance of the appeal property's front elevation.
7. On account of the property's siting, being set well back in its plot, and the screening provided by the hedge on one of the the property's side boundaries, the porch is suitably discreet in its effect on the street scene. It certainly has not harmed the visual amenities of the ASLC.
8. I conclude that the canopy has not harmed the character and appearance of the host property, the surrounding area or the ASLC. Accordingly, no material conflict arises with those provisions of policies HE1 & BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies and policies BE5, BE13, BE15 & BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies, directed in combination to ensure that house extensions are well designed so as to harmonize with the characteristics of the host property and street scene.
9. I shall therefore allow the appeal. Since the development is substantially complete, the Council's suggested conditions are unnecessary. However, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of visual amenity I shall impose a condition to ensure that the canopy is not subject to further modification without the Council's prior consent.
10. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, including the views of a local resident and the West Drayton Conservation Area Advisory Panel, whose planning-related comments I have already addressed. No other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR