



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 November 2020

by R E Jones BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253772

52 Wimborne Avenue, Hayes, UB4 0HQ

- 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 Satvir Bhatti against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72297/APP/2020/613, dated 21 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey and part two storey rear extensions and demolition of existing extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey and part two storey rear extensions and demolition of existing extension at 52 Wimbourne Avenue, Hayes UB4 0HQ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 72297/APP/2020/613, dated 21 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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 drawings: VD005/PL01; VD005/PL02; VD005/PL03; VD005/PL04; VD005/PL05; VD005/PL06; VD005/PL07 and VD005/PL08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall be those specified in the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal comprises a 6m deep flat roof rear single storey extension, while a second storey would be positioned above part of the single storey element and project approximately 3.6m from the rear wall of the dwelling. The proposed two storey extension would have a hipped roof that would sit below a box dormer that covers the majority of the appeal dwelling's main roof.
4. The appeal dwelling along with the rear of other properties along Wimbourne Avenue is visible from the neighbouring street, Dorchester Way, through a short gap in the built frontage between existing dwellings. At this location close

to the corner with Wimborne Avenue the roofs, flank and rear walls and frontages of dwellings are visible in context with the appeal dwelling. These surrounding dwellings incorporate, large dormer roof extensions, pitched and hipped roofs and projecting gables mostly finished in a mix of render, facing brick and roof tiles. Consequently, from Dorchester Way, the appeal property and the immediate built environment displays a mixed appearance with no particular consistency or uniformity between the properties.

5. The hipped roof of the proposed two storey element would contrast with the shape of the flat roof box dormer above. Yet the roof form of this part of the proposal would be broadly similar to the form of the larger hipped roofs of properties further along Wimbourne Avenue. When seen in context with the assortment of additions and roof forms within the immediate area the proposal would not have a substantial effect on the overall appearance of the street scene. Moreover, the gap in the Dorchester Way frontage from where the appeal proposal could be viewed is short, and sightings from passers-by would likely be fleeting.
6. The Council's concerns also relate to the cumulative effect of the proposed two storey and ground floor extensions. However, the proposed ground floor element would be substantially screened from the Dorchester Way vantage point by the side boundary fence relating to No 54A Wimbourne Avenue and intervening garden buildings, ensuring that both elements of the proposal would not be clearly seen together from the street.
7. I note that a previous appeal decision at the property was dismissed. In that appeal the Inspector's concerns related to the shape of the first-floor roof and the disjointed relationship with the dormer above. However, in this instance the proposed two storey element, has been reduced in height to sit below the dormer, while the roof form has been amended, to become in my view, more consistent with others in the area. Given the varied built context established close to the appeal site and visible from the street, I have not found the appeal proposal to be disjointed or harmful to the area in the way the previous Inspector refers.
8. For the reasons outlined, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies, adopted November 2012 and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies, adopted January 2020. These require proposals, amongst other considerations, to respect the surrounding area and harmonise with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development, and the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures.

Other Matter

9. There is concern regarding the internal ceiling height of the proposed first floor accommodation. This would be a Building Regulations matter; therefore I have not pursued this further.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have considered it necessary to include a schedule of plans that the development relates to, for the

avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to the construction of the extension in materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR