

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Elaine Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3156469

55 Pippins Close, Hillingdon, West Drayton, UB7 7XH

- 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 Purewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 71660/APP/2016/1593, dated 25 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension, at 55 Pippins Close, Hillingdon, West Drayton, UB7 7XH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 71660/APP/2016/1593, dated 25 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PC PA 01 Rev A Location Plan and Site Plan, and PC PA 01 Rev A Floor Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Drayton Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The West Drayton Green Conservation Area covers part of the suburban area of West Drayton. I have not been provided with a Conservation Area Appraisal or Statement but it seems to me that it incorporates the old village centre and is focussed on the area surrounding the Green where there are a number of historic buildings. The appeal property is a one bedroom back to back two storey house within a small housing estate of similar properties that were built in the 1980s.
-

4. The cul-de-sac is somewhat tucked away and inward facing and the more modern buildings here do not form part of the old village core or relate closely to the Green or any nearby historic buildings. As such, the appeal property and the other houses in Pippins Close make only a neutral contribution to defining the historic village character of the area, which is the basis of the Conservation Area's distinctiveness and significance as a heritage asset.
5. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (SPD) requires side extensions to be subordinate in scale and not to exceed two thirds of the width of the original dwelling (paragraph 4.5). It also advises that in general the front wall of the extension can be in line with the front wall of the original house, but that in some situations a set back from the front building line would be required to preserve the character of the area, particularly in Conservation Areas.
6. The proposed single storey side extension would align with the front elevation of the house and would be 3.6 metres wide with a flat crown roof. It would extend almost to the full depth of the house. Planning permission¹ has been granted for a smaller single storey side extension which is 2.7 metres wide and is set back 300 millimetres from the front wall of the host dwelling. These amendments were secured as part of the Council's consideration of that planning application but have been omitted from the appeal proposal which seeks permission for the larger originally submitted scheme.
7. The proposed extension would have a footprint almost as large as that of the modest host property and would effectively double the width of frontage. I accept that it would be a relatively large addition. On the other hand, it would be single storey and would be less than 1 metre wider than the recently approved extension. The appeal property occupies a quite spacious corner plot and a good deal of garden area would remain. The proposed crown roof would only reach to a similar height to that of the conservatory at the neighbouring house and would be hipped in from the boundaries. As such, it would not be unacceptably tall or bulky. Whilst it would be slightly wider than the roof of the approved scheme (due to the extension not being set back from the front of the house as previously) this would only be by 300 millimetres.
8. Taking all these factors into account I am not persuaded that the proposal would appear particularly disproportionate in size in relation to the host dwelling, or that it would be of such a scale so as to overwhelm its appearance. Nor do I consider that the proposed roof would appear unduly large or unattractive, or that its design would detract from the integrity of the host dwelling which is of no particular architectural merit. I am also satisfied that a set back from the front building line would not be required to preserve the character of the area in this instance (as set out in the SPD).
9. The proposed extension would be to some extent screened from view from Pippins Close and nearby properties by the existing tall fence on the front boundary, the wall on the rear boundary and a tree in the rear garden. In this context, I am content that the proposal would not appear incongruous or visually intrusive in Pippins Close. Rather, it would sit comfortably in its immediate surroundings and would generally harmonise with the street scene. Furthermore, in practical terms, I do not envisage that the appeal scheme would appear significantly different from the approved extension.

¹ 71660/APP/2016/789

10. The appeal property is not visible from outside the cul-de-sac or in views into or out of the Conservation Area. The proposal would not affect any features that contribute to the special architectural and visual qualities of West Drayton Green. Since it would be sympathetic to its surroundings and the other properties in Pippins Close it would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole. This being so, the appeal property's neutral contribution to the Conservation Area would be maintained and its character and appearance would be preserved.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and would thus preserve the character and appearance of the West Drayton Green Conservation Area, and cause no harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. Although there would be some limited conflict with the detailed guidelines in the SPD, the proposal would align with its overall aim of ensuring extensions appear subordinate to the main house.
12. The proposal would not be contrary to Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (Local Plan Part One) which seeks to conserve and enhance the District's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape including designated heritage assets such as Conservation Areas. It would align with Local Plan Part One Policy BE1 which requires new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design. It would support Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (Local Plan Part Two) which expects development in Conservation Areas to preserve or enhance those features which contribute to their special architectural and visual qualities.
13. It would accord with Local Plan Part Two Policies BE13 and BE15 which resist development that would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or would fail to safeguard the design of existing or adjoining sites. It would also align with Local Plan Part Two Policy BE19 which seeks to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. Nor would the proposal be at odds with the core planning principles of the Framework of preserving the significance of designated heritage assets and securing high quality design.

Conclusion and Conditions

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
15. A condition requiring development in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition to ensure the use of materials to match those of the existing dwelling is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Elaine Worthington

INSPECTOR