



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3251661

9 Ferrers Avenue, West Drayton, UB7 7AA

- 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 S. Shah against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 53723/APP/2020/803, dated 5 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension and creation of flank wall window at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey front extension and creation of flank wall window at first floor level at 9 Ferrers Avenue, West Drayton, UB7 7AA, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 53723/APP/2020/803, dated 5 March 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 9ferrersavenue/2019/01, 9ferrersavenue/2019/02, 9ferrersavenue/2019/17, 9ferrersavenue/2019/18 9ferrersavenue/2019/19 and 9ferrersavenue/2019/20.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located on the south eastern side of Ferrers Avenue which is a cul-de-sac primarily characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached housing. Many houses in the direct vicinity of the site feature double-storey front bay window projections. The appeal property is set-back from the highway and reflects the architectural character of this part of Ferrers Avenue in that it features a pitched roof double storey front gable. On my site visit I also observed structural fissures to the exterior and interior of the front elevation.
5. The development would largely comprise a two-storey extension to one side of the existing front gable, with a smaller alteration to the other side. The width and bulk of the extensions would not appear excessive and would not adversely alter the appearance of the building as a whole. The proposed roof profile, whilst being slightly unconventional, would appear subordinate and would adequately harmonise with the host dwelling. In my view, the prevailing character of No. 9 and the surrounding context would be preserved owing to the fact that the front gable would still appear prominently and would still be read as the property's defining architectural element. Whilst the development would be easily visible from the street and surrounding buildings, its appearance would not be obtrusive or negatively harm the townscape.
6. I therefore find the proposed development would be compatible with the existing building and would not result in a bulky and visually discordant feature that would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
7. Given the above, the proposed development would therefore not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies document and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies which together aim to ensure that alterations and extensions are well-designed, appear subordinate to the main dwelling and harmonise with the local context.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
9. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR