



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2018

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday 14th March 2018.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3181048
172 Woodrow Avenue, Hayes UB4 8QR

- 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 Mark Myhan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72723/APP/2017/1128, dated 24 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is 3m rear extension infill + two storey side extension and porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 3m rear extension infill + two storey side extension and porch extension at 172 Woodrow Avenue, Hayes UB4 8QR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 72723/APP/2017/1128, dated 18 May 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing numbers B-01, A-01, A-02, A-03, A-04 (existing and proposed front and rear elevations) and A-04 (existing and proposed side elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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. 172 Woodrow Avenue (No 172) is a two-storey dwelling with a single storey side extension, which forms an end property to a terrace of four dwellings. The two end dwellings within the terrace including the appeal property have wider ground floor frontages than the two central dwellings. Also the other end terrace 166 Woodrow Avenue (No 166) incorporates a first floor over the

- ground floor and therefore has a different form and larger scale to the appeal property, giving this particular terrace an asymmetrical design.
4. The plot for the appeal property is wide at the front and tapers to the rear. The adjacent property 174 Woodrow Avenue (No 174), which is to the east and forms part of a separate terrace of four dwellings is orientated away from the appeal property. This arrangement creates a significant gap between the two dwellings in comparison to other dwellings along Woodrow Avenue.
 5. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and the erection of a two storey side extension. This would have a similar depth to the existing extension but a slightly wider footprint. A single storey rear extension and front porch are also proposed.
 6. In considering the proposed extensions the Council has largely referred to the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions (Residential Extensions SPD). This provides design guidance for various different types of extensions to dwellings.
 7. I concur with the Council that the proposed single storey rear extension and front porch generally accord with the recommendations of the Residential Extensions SPD and are therefore acceptable.
 8. In respect of the proposed two storey side extension the Council's officer report confirms that its height and siting flush with the front of the appeal property also accord with the recommendations of the Residential Extensions SPD.
 9. However, Paragraph 5.10 of the Residential Extensions SPD states that the width of two storey side extensions should be considerably less than that of the original house and be between half and two thirds of the main house width depending on the plot size and character of the area. The Council is concerned that because the proposed extension exceeds the two thirds width recommendation it would not be subordinate to the appeal property or in keeping with the surrounding area.
 10. The appellant argues that paragraph 5.10 allows some flexibility over the width of a proposed two storey extension based on plot size and the character of the area.
 11. Irrespective of how you interpret paragraph 5.10 it is guidance and in this particular case the overall width of the proposed extension would only marginally exceed two thirds of the original dwelling. Moreover, paragraph 5.7 of the Residential Extensions SPD states that for detached and end-of-terrace dwellings, two storey side extensions should be integrated with the existing house.
 12. The proposed two storey side extension would broadly maintain the roof slope, ridge height and eaves height of the appeal property. Fenestration details would also replicate those of the appeal property and materials for the proposed extension would also match the appeal property, subject to the imposition of a condition if the appeal were to succeed. Therefore, the proposed two storey extension would assimilate with the appeal property.
 13. Furthermore, despite the width of the proposed two storey extension an appreciable gap would still be retained between the appeal property and adjacent dwelling No 174, this gap would also assist in absorbing the additional

width of the extension. As extended the appeal property would also reflect the scale and form of No 166. Thereby reflecting the character and appearance of the streetscene, whilst also adding balance and symmetry to the existing terrace of four dwellings.

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Therefore, I find no conflict with the design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies, adopted November 2012 and Saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan 1997, or the Council's Residential Extensions SPD.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have also specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the proposed extensions would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, I allow this appeal.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR