



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2025

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3365012**

**25 The Chase, Eastcote HA5 1SJ**

- 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 Bhuva against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application ref. is 18233/APP/2024/3358.
- The development proposed is a new detached garage.

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Alternative drawings were submitted with the appeal showing a garage with a smaller, single garage footprint, which I am requested to consider.
3. The appeal process should not be used to evolve proposals. Revisions intended to overcome refusal reasons should normally be tested through a fresh application. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the plans that were before the Council when it made its decision and on which parties were consulted.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

5. The site comprises a two-storey detached house with a hard surfaced front garden bounded by a brick wall with piers, railings and a metal gate about 2m in height.
6. Whilst neighbouring houses are of a similar size, detached and have surfaced front gardens, those further away and opposite are semi-detached and have front lawns and low walls or hedges with smaller driveways. Garages are typically in the rear or side gardens, lending a spacious verdant feel to the street.
7. The proposed development is to erect a detached garage in the corner of the front garden, about a metre in from and aligned with the street. It would be in brickwork to match the existing wall, have a flat roof, roller door for vehicular access and glazed sliding doors on the side facing the house.
8. I have been referred to examples of garages closer to the street than the house. These are typically in rear gardens of corner plots adjoining side streets, aligned

with front bay windows, behind the overall built line of a staggered row of houses or in situations where the built line is not clear.

9. Several of the examples are some way distant from the appeal site and in different character contexts. As there are no similar such buildings in front gardens within the nearby vicinity, the proposal would appear out of place, and reduce both the intervisibility of the house with the street and the sense of spaciousness.
10. This proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).
11. These require high quality design that enhances distinctiveness, complements the character and appearance of the area and protects public realm. They also require development to the front of a house to be minor and not alter the appearance of the house or dominate the street. I attach significant weight to this policy conflict.

### **Other Matters**

12. The appellant is unable to insure vehicles without a garage, considers that this could infringe their human rights and invokes the public sector equality duty.
13. However, the appellant's rights to peaceful enjoyment of possessions and to private and family life and the disadvantage that may result from owning vehicles with higher security requirements do not outweigh the harm I have found.
14. Owning vehicles with higher security requirements is not a protected characteristic, and therefore the public sector equality duty is not engaged in this case.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*S Simms*

INSPECTOR