The Planning Inspectorate

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: 19 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3244633
82 Royal Crescent, Ruislip HA4 0PR

- 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 Galvin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 72669/APP/2019/2890, dated 29 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2019.
- The development proposed is double storey side extension and internal alterations.

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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling occupying a prominent corner plot within an established residential area. There is substantial separation between the existing dwelling and the side boundary, and even with the existing single storey garage, the site has a spacious open character and contributes positively to the character of the surrounding area.

6. There is a turning head adjacent to the site and, with the openness afforded by the site and setback of dwellings opposite, this section of the road has a

spacious and open character which provides important relief from the more concentrated built form in the vicinity.

7. Whilst the dwelling does already exceed the return building line of properties to the rear, there is substantial separation between the dwelling and the boundary, and as such it does not appear overly prominent within the street scene. This would not be the case with the proposed extension.

8. Although some separation to the side boundary would be retained, due to its overall bulk it would be a dominant and intrusive addition when viewed from the street. The proposal would substantially increase the amount of built form beyond the return building line and, at this prominent corner location, this would significantly erode the open and spacious character of the site and surrounding area.

9. Furthermore, the side extension, due to its width, would be disproportionate to the existing dwelling. Even considering the first-floor set-back and lower ridge, it would not appear as subservient and would compete visually with the host property. The removal of the existing gable end roof would have some visual benefits, though this element does not significantly impact on the openness of this corner plot and, whilst a positive alteration in terms of the design of the host dwelling, it would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

10. Due to its overall size and bulk the two-storey extension would be a dominant and incongruous addition on this prominent corner plot, resulting in unacceptable harm to the spacious and open character of the site and the surrounding area.

11. On this basis, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to DMP Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 which seek to ensure that developments are of a high quality, being proportionate to the existing dwelling and respecting the streetscapes and established character of the surrounding area.

12. That the proposed extensions would use similar materials, and no concerns have been raised in relation to impact on neighbouring properties, would have a neutral effect and these matters do not, therefore, weigh in favour of the appeal.

13. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions in the surrounding area, and I saw on my site visit that properties have been extended in differing styles. Whilst I have considered the detail submitted there are none which appear to be directly comparable to the appeal site when considering the level of openness and spaciousness afforded by the site or its immediate environs. Furthermore, I do not have the full details of those schemes, and in any event, each case must be considered on its own merits. These other sites and schemes do not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

14. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR