



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2021

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3259108

14 Fredora Avenue, Hayes UB4 8RB

- 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 & Mrs Bassir & Marhr against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73491/APP/2020/1315, dated 24 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side and rear incl part GF rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side and rear incl part GF rear extension at 14 Fredora Avenue, Hayes UB4 8RB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 73491/APP/2020/1315, dated 24 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Unnumbered location plan, GTD1020-01, GTD1020-02, GTD1020-03, GTD1020-04, GTD1020-05 and GTD1020-06.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Number 14 Fredora Avenue (No 14) together with 1 Fairholme Crescent form a modest, pair of two-storey semi-detached properties. These are prominently positioned at a crossroads, on the corner of Fredora Avenue and Fairholme Crescent. The properties are positioned at an angle to the junction, with a large gap separating them from neighbouring properties. The surrounding area is residential, with properties along Fredora Avenue arranged in relatively uniform short terraces, with corner properties positioned at an angle to the road

junction similar to the appeal property. On the opposite corner of Fairholme Crescent there is a short terrace, also positioned at an angle to the junction.

4. The proposed development would demolish an existing single-storey store / garage building to make space for the proposed extension. This would be two-storeys at the side. Whilst the proposed extension would be more than half the width of the original house, it would only be marginally more. It would be set back from the front elevation and its hipped roof would be set below the ridge of the main roof. This would make it appear subordinate to the host property. Due to the splayed shape of the plot and the generous space around the property, the proposed extension would not appear unduly large and would not detract from the character and appearance of the host property.
5. The proposed extension would be widely visible from the surrounding area. It would project a short distance forward of the building line of the adjacent terrace. However, this would not be dissimilar to the relationship between other angled corner properties along Fredora Road which similarly extend forward of adjacent terraces. Furthermore, due to the retention of a generous gap between No 14 and the neighbouring terrace this forward projection would not be unduly prominent. In this context it would not appear at odds with development in the surrounding area.
6. I conclude the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies 2020. These policies together require new development to improve the quality of the built environment, to achieve a high quality of design that makes a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form and scale and for residential extensions to maintain the openness of the area, respect building lines, be set back and to appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

Other Matters

7. The appeal property is served by an area of off-street parking to the front of the property which would serve the enlarged dwelling. This would be adequate to serve the enlarged property.
8. The proposed extension would be set in from the boundary with the adjacent property at 16 Fredora Avenue, which is itself set away from the boundary. It would not therefore appear unduly close to this neighbouring property.
9. The effect of development on the water table and local flooding has been raised by an interested party. However, I have no firm evidence to show that flooding would be an issue.
10. A local resident has raised a concern about access to the rear of the property for emergency services. However, the existing buildings on site restrict this already. In any event, there are still gaps between this property and its neighbour should this access be required in an emergency.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy

Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match existing.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR