
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2020

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3244666

15 Airdrie Close, Hayes UB4 9SR

- 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 Ms Fernandes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 75129/APP/2019/3231, dated 3 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has confirmed that following the adoption of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020), the policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2012) and the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document have been withdrawn. I have given the appellant an opportunity to comment upon the new policies. Therefore, I do not consider it would cause prejudice to any party to assess the proposed development on the basis of the new policies.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a semi-detached house located at the end of a cul-de-sac. The dwelling is constructed from a combination of bricks and render. This is reflected on the adjoining dwelling. Neighbouring dwellings at 17-18 and 19-20 Airdrie Close are constructed to similar designs and proportions. Together these dwellings form a feature at the end of the cul-de-sac.
5. Although the proposed development would be narrower than the existing house, it would nonetheless represent a significant increase in form over the original dwelling owing to its large width. In consequence, the proposal would disrupt the relatively symmetrical design that is a feature between the appeal site and the attached dwelling. The extension would also disrupt the relationship between these two dwellings and the similarly designed, and proportioned, houses at Nos. 17-18 and 19-20 owing to its design.

6. Furthermore, the proposed extension would not be set back from the front elevation of the original dwelling at ground floor level. This increases the level of prominence of the proposed development and would exacerbate the unbalancing effect that would emanate from the extension.
7. Although the proposed extension would be set back from the front of the dwelling's porch, this structure is of relatively small proportions. In consequence, the predominant form of development is the house itself. Owing to its design, the extension would not be a subordinate addition.
8. Whilst the existing dwelling is sited on a larger plot, this is of an irregular shape. In consequence, the proposed extension would encompass a significant proportion of the land immediately to the side of the dwelling. As a result, the extension would appear overly dominant.
9. My attention has been drawn to the design of the existing dwelling. However, this design approach has been taken on many of the nearby dwellings. In consequence, this creates a notable character. Furthermore, most of the dwellings in Airdrie Close are constructed to similar widths. This means the proposed extension would result in a discordant and incongruous form of development.
10. Owing to the layout of dwellings in Airdrie Close, the extension is unlikely to result in a terracing effect as a gap between the proposal and the neighbouring dwelling would still be perceptible. However, this does not overcome my concerns arising from the extension not appearing to be a subordinate addition to the building and eroding the character of uniform dwelling widths within the vicinity.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would fail to accord with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012); and Policies DMHD1, DMHB11, and DMHB12 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new developments are of a high quality design; result in no adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the existing street; that extensions harmonise with the local context in respect of height, mass, bulk of adjacent structures, and building plot sizes and widths; and are well integrated into the surrounding area.

Other Matters

12. It has been brought to my attention that no objections to the proposed development were received from the occupiers of adjoining properties. Whilst this is a matter of note, it is only one of the points that must be considered when assessing a proposal. In result, it does not outweigh the harm as identified in respect of the Main Issue.

Conclusion

13. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR