
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2017

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3169040
117 Central Avenue, Hayes, UB3 2BS

- 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 Harbinder Oberoi against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 69406/APP/2016/4184, dated 12 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that this is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey mid terrace house, with a relatively shallow footprint (one bedroom deep at first floor level). There is an existing ground floor extension to almost the full width of the house. This protrudes out 6 metres. I estimate from the drawings that it approximately doubles the original footprint of the house.
 4. The proposal is to erect a first floor rear extension, projecting out 3.6 metres and occupying about two thirds the width of the house. One side wall would be close to the boundary with no.119 next door, while there would be a significant step back from the common boundary with no.115.
 5. The proposed extension would have a hip end with the ridge set down from the main roof. Notwithstanding these subordinate characteristics, the extension would be seen in the context of what has already been built. Together, the additions would add very considerable bulk and mass to a modest house, almost entirely occupying and transforming the rear of the building. As such I consider that they would appear unduly intrusive and incongruous within a short terrace that is not characterised by upper floor rear extensions.
 6. I observed that most rear elevations of dwellings in the vicinity could not be seen from the public highway. However, in this case, both from looking out
-

from the site and in towards it from a side road just to the north, I consider that the proposal would be visible in the street scene. It would be an unusual feature, in contrast to the relatively common two storey side extensions.

7. I have had regard to a recent appeal decision in which planning permission was given for a part single storey, part double storey rear extension nearby, at 83 East Avenue (ref APP/R5510/D/15/3134935, dated 19 January 2016). From the decision, both the form of the upper part of that extension and its outwards projection appear to be similar to this appeal proposal. However, I consider that in two important and material respects, that scheme is not entirely comparable with this appeal. Firstly, there is no indication that the double storey part would have been seen from the public realm; and secondly, there is no mention of a ground floor extension of a similar size to that at no.117.
8. The officer report mentions that the site is in the Central Avenue, Hayes Area of Special Local Character. I have been given no information as to the extent or qualities of this designation, so can give it very little weight. To the degree that the proposal would be visible in the local street scene, it may have an effect on this Area.
9. A major part of the remaining rear garden at the appeal site is occupied by outbuildings. These add to the built up character of the site, in contrast to the relatively open and spacious nature of the original layout to the rear of the appeal terrace. I consider that these existing structures serve to emphasise the high level of existing built development to the rear of the property, to which the proposal would add significantly.
10. The presence of obscure glazing in the windows of no.119, closest the boundary, and the set-back from a bedroom window at no.115, would mean that no material harm would be caused to neighbours' living conditions. However, I consider that this finding would not outweigh the significant harm with respect to character and appearance.
11. I conclude that the proposal would detract materially from the character and appearance of the building and the area. It would be contrary to a number of development plan policies. These include Policy BE1 in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies BE13, BE15 & BE19 in the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan [UDP] (1998). Among other things, these policies require development to maintain the quality of the built environment; enhance local distinctiveness; have appropriate regard to context; respect the form, scale and proportions of the original building; and complement or improve the amenity and character of a residential area. These shortcomings with respect to development plan policy are not outweighed by dimensional compliance with guidance in the Council's Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document on *Residential Extensions* (2008).
12. However, for the reason given in paragraph 8 above, I have found no conflict with Local Plan Policy HE1 or UDP Policy BE5 regarding the Area of Special Local Character.
13. Planning permission should therefore be withheld, and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR