



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2017

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3175107

15 Kingsway, Hayes UB3 2TS

- 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 H Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 60539/APP/2017/96, dated 10 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension with 2 storey side extension and part 2 storey wrap around with roof modifications.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and whether it would provide adequate living conditions for the occupants of the host dwelling with regard to private amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is located on the junction of Kingsway and Hanover Circle. Given its siting and relationship to neighbouring properties, it is read in the context of Hanover Circle more than Kingsway. Properties within the vicinity are typically detached and semi-detached, two-storey dwellings. There is a common architectural theme throughout the locality, with dwellings characterised by their open frontages, set back position from the road, simplistic elevations and hipped roofs. Furthermore, properties follow uniform building lines and have regular spacing between them. Overall, the area has a pleasant, spacious suburban character.
4. The side element of the extension would be set back from the front elevation. However, due to the dwelling being set at an angle to the neighbouring properties to the south on Hanover Circle, the extension would project beyond the forward building line of these properties. By reason of its location on the junction, the forward projection of the extension would be prominent on approach to the junction, particularly from the east along Kingsway and the south along Hanover Circle. As a result, it would disrupt the well-established

building line along Hanover Circle, which makes an important contribution to the character of the streetscene.

5. As a result of the tapered, triangular shape of the plot, part of the south side elevation of the extension would be at an angle parallel with the boundary. Consequently, the roof design would have a number of different roof planes at different angles. I appreciate that this attempts to reflect the hipped roof design of the host dwelling and throughout the area. However, the result would be an overly complex roof that would fail to respect the prevailing simplistic hipped roofs within the area and would appear incongruous in the streetscene.
6. The Council contends that the rear element of the extension would exceed the recommended two thirds of the width of the host dwelling. However, there is no evidence of where this recommendation derives from. I note that the London Borough of Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extension (SPD) 2008 provides guidance on two-storey rear extensions. However, there is no reference to them having to be no more than two thirds the width of the host dwelling. Whilst the extension would extend across much of the rear elevation of the host dwelling, its narrower width and lower ridge height would ensure that it appears visually subordinate when viewed from the rear. Therefore, I find no conflict with the SPD in this respect.
7. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (the LP1) 2012 and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (the LP2) 2012, which, amongst other matters seek to ensure that proposals achieve a high quality of design; harmonise with the existing streetscene and the original building; and complements or improves the character of the area.

Living Conditions

8. The Council contend that the amount of private garden space retained would be inadequate. This appears to have been based on a garage being present on site, which would have resulted in there being only 10sqm of garden space retained. However, at the time of my site visit, the garage had evidently been removed and the entire rear garden had been covered with decking. As a result, the appellant argues that over 70 sqm of private space would be retained.
9. The SPD states that a 4+ bedroom house should have at least 100sqm of usable rear garden space retained. It is not clear exactly how much garden space would be retained. From the observations I made on site, the retained space would be usable and sufficient in size to accommodate the needs of the occupants of the dwelling, for example an area for children to play, outdoor dining, a clothes drying area, etc.
10. Whilst there is some conflict with the SPD, the purpose of the SPD is to provide guidance. I find therefore that the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for the occupants of the host dwelling with regard to private amenity space. As such, it would comply with Policies BE19 and BE23 of the LP2,

which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new development protects residential amenity.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to a previous planning approval on the site for 'a very odd shaped side extension'. However, the details of this approved scheme are not before me and therefore I cannot make any direct comparison with the appeal proposal. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the evidence presented to me and the observations I made on site.

Conclusion

12. Whilst the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for the occupants of the host dwelling it would nevertheless have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
13. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR