



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2020

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3252258

63 Coronation Road, Hayes, UB3 4JT

- 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 Satinder Kaur Bhogal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 60621/APP/2019/4127, dated 18 December 2019 was refused by notice dated 17 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is Two Storey Side, Single Storey Rear and Part First Floor Rear Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon:
 - the character and appearance of the building and street scene; and
 - the living conditions of occupants of the building, with particular regard to private outdoor space.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house. House frontages within the street generally consist of a wide 2-storey projecting bay where the semi-detached properties join, next to a narrower set back element which accommodates the front door and entrance hall at ground floor level. These common elements create a rhythm that forms part of the street scene.
4. The proposed 2-storey extension would extend from the side of the house next to the front door. At ground floor level the extension would follow the existing building line rather than being set back from it. The resultant unbroken building line would be wider than that of the bay projection and thus become the dominant element. This would upset the balance between the two elements of the frontage and break the rhythm of varied building lines on the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore harm both the character and appearance of the house and the street scene.
5. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) that requires a high quality of design, and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the

London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (16 January 2020) (LP) which require extensions to harmonise with the local context such as building lines, setbacks and streetscape rhythm, and for two storey side extensions to be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the front elevation, respectively.

Living Conditions

6. There is an outbuilding to the rear of the appeal site. The Council is concerned that with the addition of the proposed extension there would not be enough private outdoor space for the occupants of the appeal property. The appellant has calculated that over 100 sqm of outdoor space would remain. The Council has not disputed this calculation which meets the Council's private outdoor space requirements. I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants in terms of their access to private amenity space. The proposed development would therefore meet the requirements of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 18 of the LP which require proposals for extensions to ensure that adequate garden space be retained which should be a minimum of 100 sqm for a 4 bedroom house.

Other Matters

7. The appellant points to the first floor of the side extension stepping back and suggests that this gives it a subordinate appearance. Whilst I agree that this is the case at first floor level, it does not outweigh the harm to the appearance of the dwelling at ground floor level and the resultant adverse visual impact on the street scene.
8. I note that the neighbour's extension is not set back. However, it is single storey and not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Other extensions along the street are also referred to by the appellant. Most of these had front porch extensions next to the side extensions which were set back behind the line of the porches. As such, they appear subordinate even though they may not be behind the original frontage building line. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR