
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2019

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3224967
74 Monmouth Road, Hayes UB3 4JJ

- 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 Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 64806/APP2018/4198, dated 30 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey, part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description set out in the Council's decision notice because it more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the property with regards outside space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a typical semi-detached dwelling that occupies a triangular corner plot in an area where similar properties predominate. In common with many dwellings in the local area the appeal property has already been extended, in this instance to the rear with a single storey extension. At my site visit I saw that the clearly established building line along the front of properties facing on to Monmouth Road is a key characteristic of the area.
5. The proposed extension has been designed so as to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The submitted plans show that the proposed development would see the host property extended to the side by 3300mm with a 1000mm set back from the front elevation and a 2150mm single storey extension to the rear. The plans also show the roof over the proposed extension would be set down from that off the host property. As such, the proposed development complies with much of the guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (December 2008) (the SPD).

6. However, as a result of the siting of the host property on the appeal site and the width of the proposed extension, I observed at my site visit that the extension would project forwards of the established building line along Monmouth Road to the west of the appeal site.
7. Therefore, as a result of this project the proposed development would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature within the local area and would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. I find that the proposed development is therefore contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One (the LP) and saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (the UDP) and the SPD that amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development is in keeping with the local area.

Living Conditions

9. I have been directed to saved policy BE23 of the UDP that seeks to ensure that new developments and extensions provide sufficient external living space for future residents and to the Garden Space Standards detailed in the SPD that requires properties of four or more bedrooms should retain 100sqm of garden space. The Council's report details that the *private amenity area retained measuring approximately 70 square metres*.
10. While the appellant asserts that this policy required should apply to new build development only, paragraph 3.13 of the SPD and saved policy BE23 clearly refer to extensions. Furthermore, I observed at my site visit that much of the private outside space would be situated to the rear where the garden tapers to a narrow point and as such this area of the garden would provide less usable space than a regularly shaped garden.
11. To conclude on this main issue, I find that the proposed development would not provide adequate outside space and as such would have a significant negative impact on the living conditions of future occupiers contrary to saved policy BE23 of the UDP.

Other Matters

12. I have considered the other cases identified by the appellant. However, these show distinctly different extensions to that proposed here or are on sites that are distinctly different to the appeal site. Therefore, I do not find that these set a precedent for the development proposed here.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR