



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/20/3251089

64 Providence Road, West Drayton, UB7 8HL

- 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 Maneet Sandhu (Britannia Building Services Ltd) against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 19004/APP/2019/3461, dated 26 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension to existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area;
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 66 Providence Road, with particular regard to loss of light and outlook; and
 - the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character & Appearance

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the southern side of Providence Road which is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and terraced housing. The property is set-back from the road and features a hipped roof, a driveway, an area of hardstanding to the front and a rear garden.
 5. Providence Road is defined by its spaciousness given the wide road verges and consistent gaps between the buildings. I concur with the Council's officer report which describes the area as being characterised by a prevailing uniformity of
-

space between and around the properties. In this regard, the proposed side to rear extension would jar with the prevailing surrounding pattern of development. It would appear bulky and over-dominant in light of its excessive width at double storey height. Indeed, at approximately 8 metres, its rear elevation would be wider than the existing rear elevation. In my view, the development would therefore fail to appear subservient to the host dwelling despite the proposed roof being 0.5 metres lower than the existing roof.

6. Although the development would be set-back from the front elevation and from the site's boundaries, it would constitute a disproportionate addition that would fail to harmonise with the host building and its surroundings. Furthermore, whilst the appellant asserts that the roof shape would be appropriate and would not impact the street frontage, the considerable scale of the proposed crown-roof element would be inappropriately excessive. It would thus appear awkward and would unbalance the appearance and form of the property as a whole. I accept it would not unacceptably impact the street scene however it would be visible from surrounding buildings and would erode the open character and appearance of the area.
7. I therefore find the proposed development would not be compatible with the existing building and would result in a bulky and architecturally discordant feature that would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
8. Given the above, the proposed development would therefore 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 (the 'local plan') which together aim to ensure that alterations and extensions are well-designed, appear subordinate to the main dwelling and harmonise with the local context.

Living Conditions

9. Turning to the effect of the development on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at 66 Providence Road, I consider that the double-storey height and overall scale and mass of the extension in close proximity to No 66 would have an overbearing impact and would significantly alter No.66's rear outlook. I accept there would be no breach of the 45° line from the nearest window on the main rear elevation however the development would still appear obtrusive and over-dominating when seen from the garden and patio area to the rear of No.66.
10. I note the appellant refers to the attached building being at No.62 and, separately, that No.66 being 6.4 metres away from the side extension however this is incorrect and is clearly a typographical error.
11. Notwithstanding the separation distance between the proposed extension and the common boundary with No.66, due to the orientation of the buildings with the rear elevations facing southwards, the proposal would reduce the amount of light received by the rear private outdoor amenity space of No.66 in the afternoon.
12. In light of the proposal's overall bulk, height and proximity to the attached dwelling, the development would adversely impact the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 66 Providence Road with regards to loss of outlook

and light. It would therefore conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the local plan which seek to ensure proposals achieve a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings and do not adversely impact their amenity and access to light.

Highway Safety

13. The proposed side extension would reduce the space available for parking within the paved frontage of the property. Whilst the Council states that the site would not be able to accommodate two off-street parking spaces, I find that there would still be space within the frontage to allow for standard vehicles to park albeit within slightly smaller parking spaces. In any case, there is capacity for on-street parking to the front of the appeal property and there is no reason to suggest that on-street parking in this location would unacceptably impact highway safety. Indeed, Providence Road is a relatively quiet road with little traffic that does not appear to suffer from congestion issues related to on-street parking.
14. Given the above, although the proposal may not adhere to the Council's Parking Standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 of the local plan, I have found that it would not be detrimental to highway safety. The development would therefore accord with Policy DMT6 of the local plan which states that parking requirements may be varied where it would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity.

Other Matters

15. Although I sympathise with the appellant's frustration in dealing with the Council at application stage, it was not unreasonable for the Council to have come to their final position on the matter. In any case, the overall functioning of the Council's decision-making process has had no bearing on my assessment of the planning merits of the scheme put before me. The lack of objection from neighbours does not lend positive weight to the proposal.

Recommendation

16. I have found that the proposed development would not harm highway safety however this does not outweigh the failure of the proposal to harmonise with the host dwelling and surrounding context as well as the failure to provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupants of 66 Providence Road.
17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR