



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Alison Scott BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3228192

14 Fredora Avenue, Hayes UB4 8RB

- 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 and Mrs Abdellah and Mouna Bassir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73491/APP/2019/132, dated 14 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension involving demolition of existing stores and conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - Whether the proposed development would provide appropriate living conditions for the occupiers of the host property in respect of outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The property is a two-storey semi-detached property located within a suburban area. The area is residential in character made up of short terraces and semi-detached houses. The appeal site is located on a corner plot at an intersection of four roads. Corner plots with pairs of semi-detached dwellings situated at right angles to the road are a common theme within the wider area.
4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot in the shape of an inverted 'V' with proportionately more land to the front of the dwelling than to the rear. The property resembles the characteristics of other neighbouring dwellings but has been extended by virtue of a rear conservatory and a garage erected along the western boundary with 16 Fredora Avenue.
5. To accommodate the development, the conservatory and garage would be demolished. A two-storey side extension is proposed that would wrap around the rear of the property with a chamfered gable wall set in parallel to the

- boundary with 16 Fredora Avenue. In addition, there would be a part single storey rear extension positioned on the boundary with 1 Fairholme Crescent. A series of hipped roofs and a pitched roof are proposed above the extensions.
6. The appellants argue that the appeal site can accommodate the proposed extension where its exposure within the street scene would be limited due to the configuration of the plot and relationship with 16 Fredora Avenue. In addition it is said that the development would appear subordinate due to the combination of single and two storey extensions and the use of set-backs and hipped roofs.
 7. However, the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 (SPD) advises that the width and height of two storey side extensions should be less than that of the original house. It also states that such extensions should be between half and two thirds the width of the main house with a ridgeline set down from the host ridge by 0.5m. For this development, the width of side extension would exceed this advice, whilst the ridge line would not be set down sufficiently to comply with this design guidance.
 8. Moreover, the two-storey extension would increase the width of the property considerably and would project some distance beyond the rear wall of the house. Furthermore, the development would contain a large expanse of roof above. It would, essentially, be a substantial increase to the size of the existing dwelling. As a result, in my view, the proposal would not, as the appellants argue, appear subservient to the host dwelling. Rather, I find it would not complement the proportions of the original dwelling and would appear over-dominant to the host dwelling.
 9. In addition, due to its orientation, the appeal site is visually exposed to the street scene. The development would sit further forward of the return building line of 16 Fredora Avenue where there is an established and distinctive building line in the area that this proposal would negatively distort. Consequently, it would appear as an incongruous feature in a prominent position within the street scene.
 10. I conclude, therefore, that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 which requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment including, amongst other matters, enhancing the local distinctiveness of the area. The proposal would also fail to comply with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the November 2012 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (UDP) which seek new development to harmonise in terms of scale, form and proportions and to complement or improve the amenity and character of the area.

Living Conditions

11. The Council's second reason for refusal is based on its view that the development reduces the level of external amenity space to an unacceptable standard for the occupants of the host dwelling.
12. Saved Policy BE23 of the UDP requires new residential extensions to protect external amenity space. The Council indicates that, as the ground floor study

could function as a bedroom, additional external private amenity space would be required to support the occupants. It is said that the 25sqm of private external amenity space that is proposed, would be insufficient, discounting space available to the front of the property that is not private.

13. However, a room labelled on the submitted plans as a study would not give rise to it being assumed to function as a bedroom. There is, on the face of the proposal, no net increase in the number of bedrooms proposed at the appeal property. Moreover, were I to allow the appeal, the removal of the rear conservatory and garage would create a rear garden area that would be more practical in terms of layout than what currently exists.
14. I conclude, therefore, that the development would provide appropriate living conditions for the occupiers of the host property in respect of outdoor amenity space. Consequently, the development would accord with Policy BE23 of the UDP.

Other Matters

15. I have given regard to the appellant's examples of extensions to dwellings at other corner turning sites within the local area, as they consider these have set a precedent for their own proposal. I have inspected these examples and do not agree that these represent similar circumstances. In several cases the original dwelling and plot is larger than the appeal site; the set back extends to ground and first floor; the orientation of the dwelling in the plot and relationship with its neighbours is not precisely the same; the development is not exactly the same as the proposal. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
16. I note the appellants wishes to provide improved accommodation for their growing family, however this does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified above.

Conclusion

17. Overall, despite my findings with regard to the living conditions of the occupants, I have found harm in terms of its character and appearance that is the prevailing consideration. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR