
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232411

7 Oxford Avenue, Hayes UB3 5HU

- 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 Paramjit Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 51288/APP/2019/1037, dated 24 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semi-detached dwelling, which has been extended and is located on a prominent corner plot. Existing extensions, in particular the roof alterations and dormer window, have resulted in the dwelling having a bulky appearance and it is a prominent feature within the streetscene.
4. The existing first floor of the dwelling though is inset significantly from the side boundary. This separation and the substantial rear garden ensure the appeal site retains a spacious and open character, providing relief from the built form and contributing positively to the open character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. The appeal scheme proposes a substantial extension to the first-floor side and rear of the existing dwelling. Due to the gable roof arrangement the extension would have a large flank wall and substantial expanse of brickwork to Malvern Road.
6. As a result, the extension would compete visually with the existing property, result in an increased sense of enclosure to its side and rear, and be a dominant addition when viewed from the street. Consequently, the appeal scheme would harm the open character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

7. Furthermore, the appeal scheme would emphasise the bulky appearance of the existing dwelling and its current design imbalance with the attached semi-detached house of which it forms an integral part.
8. It is acknowledged that the appeal scheme would adhere to certain aspects of the Council's, Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions 2006 (SPD) such as minimum insets from the side boundary, setback from the front elevation and lower ridge line.
9. The SPD though sets out only guiding principles for development and not prescriptive design criteria. Achieving the minimum criteria does not necessarily equate to an acceptable development and each site needs to be considered on its own merits. The SPD is however clear that a primary aim for all development is to ensure that the openness of corner plots, such as the appeal site, is maintained.
10. As detailed above, due to its design and resulting bulk and mass the extension would have a harmful impact on the openness of the appeal site and be an incongruous and dominant addition within the wider streetscene.
11. The proposed development would be contrary to; Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies 2012, which requires all new development to achieve high quality design and make a positive contribution to the local area and, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary Development Plan 1998 saved Policies, which seek to ensure developments harmonise with the streetscene, scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building and complement or improve the character of the area, as supported by the SPD.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred to a previous Inspector's decision relating to the erection of a first-floor side and rear extension on the appeal site. Although this would appear to be the same nature of development, I note that the Council's report states the dwelling still had its original hipped roof at that time and the extension was to match that design. The proposals are therefore not directly comparable.
13. As I have detailed above, it is the roof arrangement and gable end which would result in the extension having an overall bulky and dominant appearance, and which would subsequently harm the open character of the site and surrounding area. Whilst the appeal schemes are not directly comparable, I note the previous Inspector raised similar concerns regarding impact on the openness of this corner plot. The absence of harm, in terms of the neighbours living conditions, does not weigh in favour of the appeal.
14. The appellant has also referred to an extension that has been approved at 9 Oxford Avenue. I saw on my site visit that there are some comparisons between No 9 and the appeal site. Both are prominent corner properties and have been extended to the side and rear at ground floor level. However, No 9 has not been subject to roof alterations/ additions and retains its original hipped roof.

15. I note from the proposed elevations provided within the appellants statement that the extension at No 9 would similarly have a hipped roof. Therefore, the bulk and massing of both the original property and proposed extension at No 9 are not directly comparable to the appeal site or scheme. The proposals would respect the scale and form of the original dwelling and that of the semi-detached house of which it forms part. This is not the case with the appeal scheme.
16. I also saw on my site visit the extensions undertaken at No 23 and No 25 Oxford Avenue. However, as above these are also not directly comparable to the appeal site as the main dwellings and extensions both have hipped roofs which reduce their overall bulk and appearance. These other matters do not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

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

A Denby

INSPECTOR