



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2023

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3323922

108 Fairway Avenue, West Drayton, Hillingdon, UB7 7AP

- 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 Ms H Mangat against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref. 17799/APP/2023/475, dated 17 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of front porch at 108 Fairway Avenue, West Drayton, Hillingdon, UB7 7AP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 17799/APP/2023/475, dated 17 February 2023, and the plans submitted with it and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ART/2023/FP108FW/SPLP Rev.B; ART/2023/FP108FW/ELPL; ART/2023/FP108FW/PE.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at the end of one of a number of cul-de-sacs that form part of Fairway Avenue. It comprises a two storey detached property whose frontage is set aside for parking with a small garden at the rear. The frontage to the host property has a gable ended roof design, with a small single storey flat roofed extension that projects beyond the main front wall and a flat roofed canopy over the main entrance. To the north is an extensive screen of mature trees that visually dominate the area and are a positive feature of its character. Beyond these trees is a main railway line. To the

south and on the common boundary with its neighbour 110 Fairview Avenue (No.110) is a band of mature ornamental trees and shrubs. Due to the latter and the fact that the host property is set back behind the building line to No.110 (and the latter's neighbours to the south), the appeal site is largely hidden from public views and does not appear as part of the streetscene. The only public views of the whole frontage to the host are from the 'turning head' to the cul-de-sac, directly in front of the host property.

4. The property opposite the appeal site, 106A Fairview Avenue, is essentially a mirror image of the host property. However, the properties to the south of this, as with the properties to the south of the appeal site, are very different in that they are mostly semi-detached, have traditional roof profiles, are sited closer to the road and exhibit other differences in terms of their design and architectural features. As a consequence, although the appeal site forms part of this large estate, the estate does not have a uniform design or character.
5. Within this context, the appeal proposal involves the construction of a porch on the front elevation to the host property. The proposed porch would have a width of some 3.1 metres and a depth of some 1.9 metres, and would be stepped back from the front wall to the existing single storey extension. The new porch would include a flat roof that would link to the flat roof on the extension. The pallet of materials would match existing and the new porch window would match that on the first floor to the main house.
6. Policy D3 of The London Plan (March 2021) (TLP) requires developments to respond to local character. Policies DMHD 1, DMHB5 (not DMH5 as referred to in the decision notice which relates to HMO's) and DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan – Part 2 – Development Management Policies (January 2020) (HLP) also seek, amongst other requirements, for new development to: harmonise with local character; be subordinate in terms of floor area, width, depth and height; within Areas of Special Local Character to reflect the original layout and form and be in keeping with the original design of the house; and where porches are proposed to be subordinate and individually designed to respect the character and architectural features of the original building.
7. I understand that the appeal site is located within the Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). Whilst I have been provided with a plan of this area, I do not have a copy of policy DMHB5, which appears to be due, as I mentioned above, to the error in the decision notice which has led to me being provided with a copy of policy DMH5 instead. Even so, policy DMHB5 is included in the Council's Delegated Report (CDR), but other than this I have not been provided with any supporting text or design guidance, if any, for the ASLC.
8. Based on the above and the evidence before me, the proposed porch would involve the creation of a very small amount of additional floorspace which would not increase the number of rooms within the property but simply provide a weather tight area for the occupiers to use before they enter the main house. The proposal would involve a small scale extension that would be stepped back from the front wall to the existing ground floor extension. In view of this and its proposed design and window detailing, I am entirely satisfied that the proposal would be: subordinate to the host property: it would be in keeping with the design of the original house; and would retain and enhance the original features and detailing of the main house.

9. Overall, the proposed porch would integrate well with the form and design of the original house and would represent a high quality addition to it. There would, therefore, be no harmful impact on the streetscene or on the character of the ASLC, even though, as I confirmed earlier, the host property is largely hidden from public views and the wider streetscene (formed by this particular cul-de-sac). As the Appellant has also pointed out, there are other examples of approved porches in the area, including that at 35A Fairview Avenue, that have similarly not harmed the character of the ASLC and in some cases have added more interest to the properties in question.
10. The CDR refers to the impact of the proposed porch in conjunction with the conversion of the existing garage within the front extension. I note that the latter is used as an office/study and in paragraph 1.3 of the CDR is states that this conversion was approved in 1993. In view of this, I am unclear as to the relevance of this point. This conversion no doubt took place shortly after 1993 and it does not form part of the appeal proposal that is before me. Even so, the use of matching brickwork and a similar window design enables the new porch to integrate well with the existing extension and at the same remain subservient to it as a result of the porch being set back. Moreover, there are similar extensions on other properties in the street, some of which are used as accommodation and others as garages, but none of these detract from the character or appearance of the streetscene or the ASLC.
11. The Council have also referred to the policies in relation to front extensions, which require these to be minor and to not alter the overall appearance of the original house, and to not extend across the whole of the entire front elevation. However, the proposal before me is for a new porch and not a front extension. Even so, the scale of the new porch is modest, it is set back and extends to around half the width of the front elevation to the host.
12. Accordingly, I find that the proposed porch would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area including the ASLC. It would, therefore, comply with policy D3 of TLP, policies DMHD1, DMHB5 and DMHB11 of the HLP and paragraphs 130 and 134 a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (Framework).

Conditions

13. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is necessary and reasonable to reflect the details included within the application. I have, however, added a list of approved plans for clarity. A condition that requires the proposal to be built in materials to match existing is also necessary and reasonable to reflect the details shown in the application and to ensure a high quality design.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR