

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3245914
75 Raynton Drive, Hayes, London UB4 8BG

- 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 Mangat against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 58844/APP/2019/3014, dated 11 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is part 2 storey, part single storey side / rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the time since the Council refused planning permission for the proposed development it has adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies¹ (LP2). Policy DMHD1 of LP2 was referred to in the Council's reason for refusal (in its emerging form), alongside policy BE1 of Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (LP1) and the now superseded policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies 2012.
3. The appeal was submitted after the Council's adoption of LP2 and so I am satisfied that the appellant has had the opportunity to frame the grounds of appeal accordingly. I have therefore determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (LP1) sets out the Council's approach to the built environment, setting out a range of provisions to improve and maintain the quality of the Borough's built environment and to achieve a high quality of design. LP2 policy DMHD1 deals specifically with alterations and extensions to residential properties. Amongst other criteria, this policy seeks to ensure that proposals have no adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance and quality of the existing street as a result of proposals.

¹ Adopted 16 January 2020

6. It also goes on to state that proposals will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with existing buildings is achieved; extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in terms of floor area, width, depth and height and respect the design of the original house. A further range of detailed provisions and requirements are also set out in respect of both rear² and side³ extensions.
7. Raynton Drive lies within a predominantly residential, and typically suburban, setting. It is characterised by two straight rows of largely semi-detached houses on either side of a slight bend in the road. No. 75 is the last in a row of semi-detached houses and is located on the outside of the slight corner. Next to it lies a detached house and, beyond that, a large school site.
8. Each pair of semi-detached houses is separated from the next by narrow driveways which provide access to outbuildings and rear gardens behind. The appeal site benefits from a larger gap to the side, which increases further towards the rear as the garden plot splays outwards. In this sense, both the appeal property and the detached house next to it depart from the otherwise consistent layout of, and relationship between, of predominantly semi-detached houses.
9. At the rear of the property is a large flat roofed single storey extension. The single storey rear element of the proposed extension would align with the existing structure in terms of its overall depth and its width would also be broadly comparable to that of the main house. Although further single storey elements at the side of the house would be staggered to reflect the alignment of the fence between No. 75 and the neighbouring detached house, the single storey extension would nonetheless be a substantial addition to the side and rear of the property. It would, individually and cumulatively with the existing rear extension, dominate the side and rear of the property in a manner that would be at odds with the property's fundamental character and appearance.
10. The staggered design of the various elements of the side extension would, to a degree, reduce the perception of this element's overall scale. Its position on the property towards the side / rear of the host building, would also reduce its direct impact on the character and appearance of No. 75 and the wider streetscene when viewed from certain angles. However, in others the proposal would be an excessive and inappropriate form of extension which would dominate the side and rear elevations of the host property. The large, unsympathetic expanse of flat roof would also fail to reflect the architectural style and form of the host property and the dwelling's resulting form would be at odds with the prevailing form, character and appearance of properties on Raynton Drive.
11. The appeal property has also been extended by way of a hip-to-gable extension. One of the criteria set out in LP2 policy DMHD1 is that two storey side extensions to properties with previous hip-to-gable extensions will not be supported. Although the supporting text to policy DMHD1 explains the approach to various other forms of extension, it does not provide justification for this approach to properties with hip-to-gable extensions.

² LP2 policy DMHD1(B) (i) to (ix)

³ LP2 policy DMHD1(C) (i) to (vii)

12. When viewed in isolation, the proposed two storey extension at the side of No. 75 would satisfy certain criteria set out by LP2 policy DMHD1. The extension would be set back from the front corner of the main house, its width would be modest and its roof ridge and front facing roof plane would be set down, and back, from the corresponding elements of the main house. The gable design of the two storey side extension would also reflect that of the existing dwelling, even if not reflective of the property's original roof form.
13. However, when viewed as one half of a semi-detached property with No. 77, the two storey side extension would be an incongruous addition to the property. Raynton Drive is characterised by semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. The repetition of the prevailing roof form, with the spacing between properties, imbues the street with a pleasing consistency and rhythm. I accept that the pair formed by Nos. 75 and 77 are already somewhat unbalanced by the previous hip-to-gable extension. I accept, too, that as it lies at the end of this particular row of houses, the greater space at the side of No. 75 also marks it out as different to the prevailing development pattern along the street. However, within a streetscene notable for its relative consistency, balance and rhythm along the properties, the extension would be an incongruous addition, the significance of which would be highlighted by the exposed nature of No. 75's gable elevation in views from the south.
14. It is clear that the Council have reservations regarding the principle and detail of the proposed two storey side extension, even if this is not fully articulated in the reason for refusal. It is also clear that LP2 policy DMHD1 sets out a particular approach to side extensions on properties which have previously benefited from a hip-to-gable extension. However, as the supporting text to LP2 policy DMHD1 does not set out the reasoning or justification behind this approach, the weight that I give to its particular provisions is reduced and it is not decisive in this respect. Nevertheless the proposal, when taken as a whole, would result in an inappropriate, incongruous and unsympathetic extension which would fail to be subordinate to, or reflect the form, character or appearance of, the host building. Thus, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with LP2 policy DMHD1 or LP1 policy BE1, failing to secure the high quality design sought by the development plan as a whole and which the National Planning Policy Framework identifies as being fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons I have set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR