
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3158696

58 Tollgate Drive, Hayes, Middx

- 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 B Raja against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 59865/APP/2016/2102, dated 20 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is first storey side extension, roof conversion and pitched roof to existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There is no applicant detailed on the original application form. As such, I have used the name as it appears on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises an end of terrace property located in an established residential area. It is already significantly larger in both height and scale from the remainder of the terrace. It therefore represents a prominent feature at the end of the cul de sac.
 5. The proposal including alterations to the roof form would increase the bulk and massing of the host property, which I have already identified as being visually prominent within the overall street scene. The size and scale of the extension in this end of terrace location would be at odds with the established pattern and form of development in the area. It would therefore cause harm to both the host property and the street scene as a result.
 6. My attention has been drawn to the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions (SPD) 2008. This document advises at paragraph 7.5 that extensions should appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it will be set. In addition, paragraph 7.11 advises that planning permission will normally be refused for hip to gable conversions as they would unbalance the overall
-

appearance of the house. The proposal would be in direct conflict with the SPD in this regard.

7. As a result of the roof design and scale of the proposal, I therefore conclude the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be in direct conflict with policies BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (LP) 2012. Policy BE1 is a general policy relating to the built environment. It advises, amongst other things that all new development should achieve a high quality design which enhances local distinctiveness. Policy BE13 advises that development will not be permitted if the layout or appearance fails to harmonise with the existing street scene. Policy BE15 advises that extensions to existing buildings will be permitted where they harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Policy BE19 advises, amongst other things, that new development within residential areas should complement or improve the amenity of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR