

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3155813
50 Gade Close, Hayes, Hillingdon, UB3 3PY

- 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 Alan Rogers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 71211/APP/2016/1112, dated 20 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two-storey, part first floor, part single-storey side extension including conversion of garage to habitable use and single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two-storey, part first floor, part single-storey side extension including conversion of garage to habitable use and single-storey rear extension at 50 Gade Close, Hayes, Hillingdon, UB3 3PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 71211/APP/2016/1112, dated 20 January 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: Drg Nos 016_PA_2-1 Rev. A, 016_PA_2-2 Rev. A and 016_PA_2-3 Rev. A.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extensions upon the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling set within a residential cul-de-sac containing properties of similar age and style. In-keeping with most other end terraces and semi-detached dwellings in Gade Close No 50 has an attached garage to the side that is recessed behind the main front elevation. It also has a forward projecting lean-to entrance porch to the front, also a common feature in the area. The proposal is to create a two-storey side addition by building over the existing garage and projecting the entire addition forward to align with the main front façade of the dwelling and with a further single-storey projection to the front that would align with and effectively extend the existing porch sideways. A single-storey rear addition is also proposed across the full width of the plot in lieu of an existing conservatory.
4. The Council is of the view that the proposal would add excessive bulk to the front of the dwelling and that by so doing it would detract from the original composition and symmetry of the dwelling. I disagree. There is little, if any symmetry to the composition of the existing dwelling or indeed the terrace of which it forms part. The porch to No 50 is set to one side of the dwelling and the fenestration pattern to the front is asymmetrical. The attached garage further imbalances the appearance of No 50 and there is no repeat feature to the property at the other end of the terrace, which in any event is staggered in its alignment. The alternative composition of development to the side of No 50 would therefore not result in the disruption of any symmetry.
5. In terms of bulk and appearance, I find that the proposal would be seen as a fairly seamless and logical sideways extension to the existing form of the appeal property. Its width would marginally exceed the guideline within paragraph 5.10 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions. This states that the width of a two-storey side extension in relation to the original house should be less than two thirds of the main house. However, in my assessment the addition would not appear disproportionate.
6. There is a vehicular access to the side of No 50 that leads to a communal parking area to the rear. Although the first floor side addition would fail to maintain a 1.5m separation to the plot's boundary, the minimum required by paragraph 5.1 of the HDAS, there would be no serious erosion of the existing gap with No 49 opposite.
7. Overall, I find that the proposal would be of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the existing dwelling and in-keeping with the residential character and appearance of the area. Moreover, it would mirror an extension to No 49 which was granted planning permission on appeal in 2010 (Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/10/2126490) and which I saw to sit comfortably in its setting. There would therefore be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy BE1: *Built Environment* of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012, or with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon UDP Saved Policies (2012), insofar as they all relate to the need to achieve high quality in design and for development to respect the scale and composition of existing buildings and to harmonise with the street scene and wider area.

Conditions

8. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the new works are carried out in materials to match the existing. The Council has suggested a comprehensive landscaping condition that would require the prior submission and approval of details for a whole host of soft and hard landscape features before any development could take place. However, given the small scale nature of the proposal and the absence of any significant change proposed to the existing front garden arrangement such a requirement would be unreasonable and unnecessary.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR