
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3250993
257 Station Road, Hayes UB3 4JE

- 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 and Mrs Badyal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 25813/APP/2019/2684, dated 12 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey attached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is currently occupied by a semi-detached, 2 storey house. It faces onto Station Road and sits at the junction with Crowland Avenue, where the houses are set at right-angles to the appeal property. The side garden area at the appeal site is quite wide and its rear parts accommodate a single storey structure which is built up to the side plot boundary. However, this is set back from the front of the house and is largely screened by the boundary wall that encloses the rear parts of the appeal site.
4. The proposal would be on the same front line at the existing 2 storey house and would extend close to the boundary with Crowland Avenue. It would be around 1.5m taller than the existing side structure, according to the Council's figures, and would have a crown roof. I agree with my fellow Inspector when determining the previous appeal at this property for a 2 storey side addition (Ref; APP/R5510/W/19/ 3220341), that the existing single storey structures at the appeal site are discrete and, whilst they do project forwards of the front building line of houses on Crowland Avenue, they do not challenge that building line or erode the sense of space that exists here. In addition, I agree with the assessment that the open front garden and part of the side garden, with the lower boundary wall, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposal would significantly erode the sense of spaciousness here as it would intrude within the open area at the side, close to the apex of the corner. As it would be significantly taller than the existing structures, it would be far more visually prominent and would be clearly visible from along Crowland Avenue, where its forward projection beyond the front of the houses on that road would make the proposal prominent and visually obtrusive. In addition, I agree with the point put forward by the Council, that the crown roof would represent an awkward design feature which would mean that the proposal fail to harmonise with the existing structure.
6. The appellant has drawn my attention to various other extensions within the area and I have had the opportunity to see these at my site visit. In this respect, I have noted the obvious presence of the 2 storey extension on the opposite side of the junction. I am in agreement with the previous Inspector that this has a negative effect on the area and so should not be seen as a precedent. I am also aware that I do not have any details of the circumstance surrounding the construction of these extensions and the likelihood is that they were not considered under the policies within the recently adopted Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) (DMP).
7. In conclusion, I consider that the proposal would appear unacceptably prominent at this corner location and would give rise to a loss of openness. The appearance of the proposal means that it would fail to harmonise with the existing house. In these respects, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the provisions of Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the DMP. I have taken account of all other matters referred to in the submissions but find nothing sufficient to outweigh the conflict that I have identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR