



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3236482 63 Warwick Crescent, Hayes, UB4 8RG

- 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 Asif Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 31426/APP/2019/1581, dated 10 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is veranda after single storey rear extension in family house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the application was determined, the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Development Management Policies, 2020 (DMP) has been adopted, and as such I have had regard to it in making my decision. The DMP has replaced the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies, 2012 (LP-2012) and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, 2008 (HDAS). Therefore, although the Council's decision notice refers to policies within that plan, the LP-2012 and HDAS are no longer material considerations.
3. The Council have identified the Policies in the DMP that they consider are relevant to the appeal scheme, and the appellant has been provided with an opportunity to comment on the now adopted DMP. I have therefore had regard to the most up to date development plan position as I determine this appeal.
4. On the site visit I noted that works have been undertaken at the appeal site, though these works appear to differ from those shown on the submitted plans. In determining this appeal, my decision has been considered on the basis of the plans submitted, albeit there is limited information on the proposed materials. Therefore, in the absence of this detailed information I have considered it would be constructed as per the materials that are presently in situ, on the structure that has been erected at the site.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the impact of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area and host property; and

- The living conditions of the existing occupiers of No 61 Warwick Crescent, with particular regard to visual impact and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace property which has a single storey full width extension to the rear. The main dwelling is compact and sits within a narrow plot, and this style and layout of development is characteristic of the surrounding area.
7. The proposal is to construct a veranda to the rear of the existing extension that would also span the width of the plot. The veranda would consist of a combination of polycarbonate sheeting, block and timber walls to the side elevations and a mono pitched polycarbonate roof, supported by a timber frame and posts.
8. Although the veranda would be single storey, it would significantly increase the depth of development to the rear of the existing property. It would be disproportionate and not appear as subordinate to the main dwelling, thereby diminishing the character of the host property.
9. There is a pedestrian access to the side of the site, and due to the angled relationship to the adjacent property, the proposed extension would be visible from the street. However, considering the setback and that only the side elevation would be visible, it would not be an overly prominent feature. Nevertheless, the overall scale of the development to the rear would be noticeable and this would detract from the character of the existing dwelling and that of the surrounding area.
10. As detailed above, I have considered the proposal on the basis that the materials would be as per those that are currently in situ on the site, and this includes polycarbonate sheeting to the side elevations and roof. Whilst this would not match the materials on the main dwelling, I do not consider its use would be so discordant as to be sufficient in its own right to withhold planning permission, though it does add to my above stated concerns.
11. Therefore, due to the depth of the proposed development it would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. On this basis I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1, Strategic Policies, 2012, and DMP Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12, which amongst other things, seek to ensure that all developments achieve a high quality of design, taking account of and respecting local distinctiveness, and the form and scale of existing development.

Living conditions

12. The proposed extension would directly adjoin the side boundary with No 61 which is attached to the appeal site as part of the terrace. No 61 has single storey extensions to the rear, though these are not directly adjacent to the appeal site, and do not span the whole width of the plot.
13. The proposal would therefore result in a substantial increase in the development to the side boundary with No 61, and I saw on my site visit that

there are existing windows to the rear of this property in very close proximity to the site boundary. The extension would be clearly visible above the existing fence and, although it would be a lightweight structure, it would be a far more dominant feature than the existing boundary treatment.

14. The plot at No 61 is narrow and the boundary also tapers to the rear, considering this, the proximity and projection of the proposal beyond the main rear elevation would result in a sense of enclosure when viewed from No 61. The proposal would be visually prominent and intrusive in outward views and this would have an unacceptable harmful impact on outlook.
15. On that basis, the proposed development would be contrary to DMP Policies DMHD1, and DMHB11, and the supporting design guidance in Appendix A, which amongst other things, seeks to ensure a good standard of residential amenity is maintained.

Other Matters

16. The appellant has stated that other properties in the surrounding area have extended to a depth similar to that proposed at the appeal site. Whilst I saw on my site visit that there are properties in the surrounding area which have been extended in differing styles, I do not know the full circumstances of those schemes or their relationship to adjacent properties. In any event each case must be considered on its own merits.
17. Furthermore, although the appellant has stated they were advised they could build a larger extension there is little in the evidence before me as to the details that were provided or discussed. The information does refer to both adjoining neighbours having already extended to the rear, though as detailed above the extension to No 61 does not extend the full width of the plot. Therefore, having considered the appeal on its merits these other matters do not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons stated above the appeal is therefore dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR