

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3175044

14 Ferncroft Avenue, Eastcote, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 9JF

- 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 Brian Drewett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 38007/APP/2016/4426, dated 3 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2017.
 - The development is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. It is acknowledged that construction of the extension originally commenced on the understanding that it was permitted development. At the time of the site visit the extension was substantively complete although still to be rendered.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of which it forms a part and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located in a formally laid out residential area and comprises a two storey semi-detached house. Along with the attached dwelling, it occupies a prominent corner location alongside the junction of Ferncroft Avenue and Pavilion Way.
5. The properties found alongside the junctions in the nearby area have a distinct character and appearance. This includes rounded brick corners which at the ground floor incorporates a front door with a window symmetrically placed on either side. In the case of the appeal property and its neighbour, as well as No 12 Ferncroft Avenue and its neighbour located on the opposite side of the junction, the corner elements stand a small degree forward of the adjacent building lines. As a consequence, these elements appear as the most prominent parts of the respective street scenes and are important design features.
6. The side extension at the appeal property is not fully enclosed by the adjoining fence. It also rises above the fence and the soft landscaping. Its bulk is therefore visible from the front of the property and from the south west. Viewed from the front, it has an extremely poor relationship with the original

architectural composition of the house because it has covered one of the relevant side windows and significantly eroded the symmetry of the important corner feature. Viewed from the south west, it projects well beyond the corner feature and has become the most conspicuous part of the street scene.

7. The development therefore appears as an awkward and incongruous addition which is wholly unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding built form. The completion of the development with white painted render would not mitigate its harmful impact.
8. Although the attached property has a side extension, it is not directly comparable. It is set back so that it does not cover the relevant side window, thereby leaving the corner feature largely intact. The appeal development has not 'balanced up' the pair of houses as the appellant suggests but created a greater divergence.
9. The side extension at No 12 and those found alongside the junction of Ferncroft Avenue and Field End Road are similarly set back from the side window. Whilst there are examples in Greencroft Avenue and Broadhurst Gardens where side extensions have covered the window, they form part of different street scenes and do not appear to project beyond a building line to the same extent as the appeal development. In any event, they do not provide justification for a scheme which is harmful in its own right.
10. The benefits of the development are acknowledged, particularly in light of the identified personal circumstances of the appellant. Its small scale in comparison to some of the other side extensions and its neutral effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers are also acknowledged. Nevertheless, these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm of the development. Moreover, it has not been demonstrated that the extension, as built, was the only possible design solution.
11. It is therefore concluded that the development has an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of which it forms a part and the surrounding area. It conflicts 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 seek to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the character of the area. They also seek to ensure that extensions harmonise with the form and architectural composition of the original building.
12. The development also conflicts with the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document 2008. The guidance sets out that careful thought has to be applied to the location and overall appearance of any side extension.

Conclusion

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

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON