
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 22 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3170602
20 Northfield Park, Hayes, UB3 4NU

- 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 Gurbaksh Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 60462/APP/2016/3453, dated 15 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side (to the side boundary) and rear extension (no more than 12^{ft} from rear of the property).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension at 20 Northfield Park, Hayes, UB3 4NU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 60462/APP/2016/3453, dated 15 September 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: Location Plans and GS/O5.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development on the application form which I have included in the heading above includes superfluous description which is not an act of development and I have therefore omitted these phrases from the description used in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house situated on the inside of a right-angled bend. Along with its neighbour, 22 Northfield Park, the pair are set at an angle to the short terraces of houses running in either direction along
-

the street. The proposal would extend the property at ground floor to the rear and to the side up to the site boundary it shares with 18 Northfield Park. The front of the extension would largely be set at an angle to the front of No 20 but be in line with the front elevation of No 18.

5. The single storey height and tapering footprint of the extension would mean that it would appear as a subservient addition to the two storey property. Its alignment with the front of No 18 would keep it within existing building lines and it would not appear as a prominent feature in the streetscene despite its corner location. Whilst it would occupy the gap which currently exists between the flank wall of the host property and the boundary, its limited size would not make it appear as an incongruous addition to the existing house.
6. The Council's guidance¹ recommends that single storey side extensions should be between half and two thirds of the original house width depending on the plot size and character of the area. The extension is roughly triangular in plan at the side and its width varies, although at its widest it would appear to be greater than half the original house width. However, notwithstanding its width, the angle to which the front elevation of the extension would rake back from that of the host building would create a subservient relationship which is the aim of the guidance.
7. When I visited the site I noted that a number of other semi-detached properties on corner sites on Northfield Park and the adjoining Northfield Close have single storey side additions which extend to the boundaries of those plots, in particular next door at No 22. The Council advise that this, and a previous similar proposal at the appeal site, were approved before the adoption of planning guidance. Those existing side additions nevertheless form part of the established streetscene. Whilst not identical in detailing to other examples in the vicinity, the proposal would not appear at odds with the character or appearance of the area in such a context.
8. The proposal would therefore be appropriate to its context and harmonise with the existing streetscene, the character of the area and the existing building. As such it would comply with the requirements of Local Plan² Policy BE1 and saved UDP³ Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19.

Conditions

9. It is necessary to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. It is necessary to require that external materials match the host building to preserve the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, and would accord with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions, 2008.

² A Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies, 2012.

³ London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, 1998.