



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3237482 29 Great Benty, West Drayton, UB7 7UP

- 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 & Mrs S. McKenzie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 33287/APP/2019/2163, dated 26 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 'single storey side, front and rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a single storey side, front and rear extension at 29 Great Benty, West Drayton, UB7 7UP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 33287/APP/2019/2163, dated 26 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 06/359/11, 06/359/12, 06/359/13 Rev. B, 06/359/14 Rev. A, 06/359/200A.

Preliminary matters

2. The appellant already has permission to build a single storey side and rear extension (33287/APP/2019/1211) and the Council's refusal of the current application relates to the single storey front extension, which is therefore the focus of this decision.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the single storey front extension on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

4. The property is an end of terrace, two-storey house in a suburban residential area. It is part of a large housing estate of uniform brick houses with pitched

tile roofs, of regular spacing and design. Many frontages have not been significantly altered since they were built and comprise a flush doorway with overhead concrete canopy, a short front garden, and driveway. Porch lean-tos, brick porches and downstairs bay front windows have been added to many properties to the extent that they now contribute to definition of the character of the area. The host house has a brick porch with a flat roof and bay front window, both of which would be removed as part of this development. Permission is sought for a 1m deep, single storey extension with pitched roof across the entire front of the house.

5. I consider that the proposed porch would not harm the appearance of the host property. This is because an enclosed brick porch of similar depth is already present, reducing the extent of change required, and the addition of a pitched roof is considered an improvement because it better reflects the design of the original building. The proposed side extension would occupy the current driveway and add to the bulk of the property when viewed from the front, but I take into account that this will be set back from the proposed frontage and overall, I do not find conflict with Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), which requires extensions to harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building.
6. Paragraph 8.1 of the adopted Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document (2008)(SPD), a material consideration to which I give substantial weight, states that ‘Front extensions that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused’ because they are considered ‘eye catching’ and will have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the street. Policy DMHD 1 of the Emerging Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) states that ‘front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused’; given that this plan is near adoption, I give this substantial weight. Front extensions are not characteristic of the wider area and the policies are clear that they are unlikely ordinarily to be acceptable.
7. However, No 29 is located in the middle of a set of terraces that depart from the prevailing character of terrace blocks on the estate, because three of the eight houses already have single storey front extensions. This would make the proposals less ‘eye catching’ than if built elsewhere on the estate and on this basis the development is not considered to be visually intrusive on the street to the extent that would cause harm. Given this specific context, the proposal is also not considered to conflict with BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) or the SPD, which seek to protect local character. I have also considered Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), which requires that all new development should achieve a high quality of design and make a positive contribution to the local area and Policy BE19, which requires that any new development complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. Whilst in my opinion the development would not make a significantly positive contribution to the appearance or character of the area, no harm is identified and, on balance, the proposals are considered acceptable when reviewed against these policies.

Conclusions

8. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. In addition to the standard commencement condition, I shall require the use of matching materials and accordance with the approved plans in the interests of local character and good planning.

B Davies

Inspector