



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2024

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3352816

68 Hatch Lane Harmondsworth West Drayton UB7 0BA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Rajbir Singh against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 11905/APP/2024/1332.
- The development proposed is a Two storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Two Storey side extension at 68 Hatch Lane Harmondsworth West Drayton UB7 0BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 11905/APP/2024/1332, and the plans submitted with it, 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: XEVA/68HL/401B; XEVA/68HL/402B; XEVA/68HL/404B; XEVA/68HL/405B; XEVA/68HL/407B.
 - 3) Materials employed in the construction of the external walls and roof of the development hereby approved shall match those found in 68 Hatch Lane.
 - 4) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a scheme for the treatment of boundaries and forecourt area including planting of trees shrubs or hedges, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of:
 - Boundary treatments to the front, north side and rear of No.68 Hatch Lane,
 - Surfacing materials to the forecourt parking area,
 - Location and species of plantingand be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development, and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the development.
 - 5) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the development hereby approved or the

completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street-scene and the Harmondsworth Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 68 Hatch Lane (No.68), occupies a corner plot at the junction on Hatch Lane and is mirrored with No.66, a similar house on the opposing corner forming what might be argued as a gateway to Candover Close, a short cul-de-sac characterised by two-storey semi-detached housing dating from the middle of the twentieth-century.
4. The appeal site lies within the Harmondsworth Village Conservation Area (HVCA) that encloses the medieval centre of Harmondsworth village with a perimeter along Hatch Lane to the front of No.68 which there overlooks open land. The published character appraisal for the HVCA refers to the 'pleasing plan form' of Candover Close, the materials and form of its houses together with attractive boundary features but otherwise makes little comment as to the character of this part of the HVCA or how it could be enhanced.
5. No.66 has a flat-roofed single storey side extension with a flank and side boundary wall in pebble-dash render; timbering to its flank gable has been removed. No.68 has been subject to some renovation, but irrespective of the appearance of these dwellings I consider the presentation of these properties to the street is significantly impaired by unsympathetic boundary treatments, an absence of visible planting and extensive hard surfacing. These are aspects of the 'gateway' properties at the entrance to Candover Close which currently fail to preserve the character and appearance of the HVCA.
6. Little information is provided as to the proposed treatment of the curtilage which would be affected by the proposed extension. The extension would occupy the existing space at the side of No.68 leaving a 1.0m walkway within the side boundary, reducing the perceived¹ width between No.66 and No.68. Although this would reduce a desirable sense of openness at the entrance point to a part of the HVCA which retains, in the way outlined in the character appraisal, a degree of original character², I must determine the proposals with regard to the general duty set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) to preserve or enhance its character as a whole. I have already identified the absence of green softening and poor quality fencing/walling at No.68 as a harmful factor of significance, given the prominent position of the appeal site. Although these matters are finely balanced, it is my conclusion that a carefully detailed and well-considered scheme to improve boundary features and forecourt area that reflects more traditional features, together with some visual softening (planting), would make a positive contribution to the

¹ At upper floor level which would have an enclosing effect

² The parts of Candover Close which largely retain original features and greenery

street scene which could outweigh harm from the insertion of the side extension. Consequently, and notwithstanding the concerns of the Council as to the insertion of an upper floor level extension and the previous refusal of permission at No.66, I consider that overall, with suitable enhancements to the elements identified controlled by condition, the resulting development would, overall, preserve the character and appearance of the HVCA by improving the visual cohesion of elements which are prominent in the street scene.

7. I have no other matters before me to consider and therefore conclude for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, that there would be no conflict with Policies DMHD1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 or DMHB12 all of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (DMHB) which seek to avoid harm to the historic environment and that development should apply high quality design and be well integrated into the surrounding environment.
8. Consequently the appeal succeeds subject to the conditions necessary to ensure the basis of my determination is achieved, which would include, together with the usual plans, timing and materials conditions, suitable details for boundaries, of hard paving which is apparent in the street scene together with appropriate shrub or tree planting.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR