

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

**by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3170726**  
**94 Glebe Avenue, Ickenham UB10 8PD**

- 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 Raj Fatania against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 54202/APP/2016/3872, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
  - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site forms a corner plot on the northern side of the junction with Clovelly Avenue. It comprises ground floor shop units and a flat at first floor level. There is a single storey extension at the side above which it is proposed to build a first floor extension to enlarge the flat. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character composed mainly of semi-detached houses with hipped pitched roofs. There are other road junctions close to the appeal site where buildings are generally set away from site boundaries contributing to the open character of the area which I consider is important.
4. The extension would be flush with the building's front and rear walls and have a gable end roof over to match that at the other end of the terrace. The development would be forward of the short building line formed by 2 and 4 Clovelly Avenue. But this is not a strong feature given the curvature of the road and the presence of a tree in the front garden to no.2. The house on the opposite side of the junction, 96 Glebe Avenue, has the rear corner of the flank wall forward of the building line formed from the odd numbered houses in Clovelly Avenue. This corner is some 5 metres from the footway and does not detract from the open character of the junction. By contrast, the front corner of the proposed extension would be less than 2 metres from the back edge of the footway to Clovelly Avenue. Its siting, depth and height would result in a built mass that would undermine the present open appearance of the junction and which would not be characteristic of the wider area.

5. In this respect I concur with the conclusions reached by an Inspector handling an appeal at this site in 2013 in relation to a similar development<sup>1</sup>. The development now proposed would significantly encroach into the open nature of the junction area at first floor level, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) that requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. Similarly, the proposal would be in conflict with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved Policies (November 2012) where they seek to ensure that new development harmonises with the existing streetscene and complements the character of an area. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, provides detailed guidance on first floor side extensions, including on the need to maintain openness on corner plots; the proposal would also be in conflict with this guidance.
7. I acknowledge that the appellant has made a series of applications for a first floor side extension and that the gable end roof now proposed has been designed to better match the roof scape of the terrace than the hip end previously proposed. However, the gable end would add to the overall mass of the development on this corner site. I note that matching materials would be used and that on-site parking is proposed for commercial users at the site and for the enlarged residential unit. The appellant points out that the junction of Clovelly Avenue with Glebe Avenue is typical of many road junctions and does not enjoy any special character of open spaciousness. Reference is also made to the nearby junction of Glebe Avenue with Burnham Avenue where there is a triangular green with trees and a more spacious and verdant character. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm to the open character of this junction that I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

8. Having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

*Rory MacLeod*

INSPECTOR