The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3174551
54 Beechwood Avenue, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 1JW

- 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 Mrs Denise Dormer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 46227/APP/2016/4601, dated 6 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2017.
- The development proposed is single storey side extension for disabled person.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated in a formally laid out residential area. It is a two storey end of terrace house that occupies a prominent corner plot position alongside the junction of Beechwood Avenue with Ash Grove.

4. The houses on the south side of Ash Grove are set back and positioned along a well-defined building line. The front corner of the appeal house is in direct alignment with this building line. As a result, the garden area to the side forms a continuation of the set back along Ash Grove. On the opposite street corner, there is a similar relationship in respect of No 58 Beechwood Avenue and the north side of Ash Grove.

5. Owing to the building line, the undeveloped nature of the area to the side of the house is important to the character and spaciousness of the Ash Grove street scene. However, as the appellant acknowledges, Beechwood Avenue is a tightly developed area with little space between the properties. Only Nos 54 and 58 have any side garden areas in this part of the street. As a consequence, the area to the side of the house is also important to the character and spaciousness of the host property and the Beechwood Avenue street scene.

6. The proposal is for a single storey side extension with a lean-to roof that would be set back a short distance from the front elevation of the dwelling. As the house is positioned at an angle relative to the Ash Grove boundary, it is

acknowledged the rear of the extension would be positioned further away from the boundary than the front.

7. Nevertheless, the front of the extension would reduce the gap between the side of the house and the boundary to around 1.6m. It would significantly breach the Ash Grove building line and it would harmfully erode the existing sense of spaciousness found to the side of the house. In turn, it would harmfully erode the contribution that this area makes to the spaciousness of the Ash Grove and the Beechwood Avenue street scenes.

8. This harm would not be adequately mitigated by the fact the extension is single storey or through the screening provided by the boundary treatment. As the roof would commence just below the first floor windows, the erosion of the space to the side of the house would be discernible above the existing boundary hedge and from the front of the property. The appellant claims it is conceivable the Council would grant planning permission for the erection of a 2m high means of enclosure along the northern boundary. However, that has not been demonstrated and even if it were to be the case, the extension and its harmful impacts would remain discernible.

9. Whilst the appellant contrasts the effect of the proposal with a camper van or caravan being parked alongside the property, the two are not directly comparable. A camper van or caravan would not have the same physical or visual sense of permanence as an extension.

10. The personal circumstances noted by the appellant and the associated benefits the development would bring are acknowledged. However, these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm that arises from the proposal. Moreover, it is not clear that the proposed scheme is the only possible design solution.

11. In light of the above, it is concluded that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The development would thereby conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2007. Amongst other things, these policies specify that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene. They also seek to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the character of the area.

12. It would also conflict with the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document 2008. This guidance sets out that building lines should be respected.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON