



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 04 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3263235

Site Address: 2A Whittington Avenue, Hayes UB4 0AB

- 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 Keith McCannon against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 59942/APP/2020/2495, dated 10 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension including conversion of garage to habitable room and extension to porch to front.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - (i) the effect of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the current and future occupiers of the appeal dwelling, with regard to garden space.
 - (ii) the effect of the two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living conditions

4. The back garden of the dwelling is modest and consists of a smaller area of patio in comparison to the lawn. This backs onto the beer garden located to the rear of Ye Olde Crown Public House on Uxbridge Road. It is also enclosed to the sides and rear by fencing.
5. The proposal includes the erection of a single storey rear extension with a flat roof. This would cover almost the entire rear elevation, with the plans indicating it would project 2.3m. Policy DMHD 1 and Policy DMHB 18 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 (The Local Plan Part 2) state that alterations and extensions to

residential dwellings should retain adequate garden space. It is noted that this private amenity space provision would not meet the required 100 square metres (minimum) for a four-bedroom dwelling and would therefore not comply with Policy DMHB 18 of The Local Plan. The proposal would result in very limited usable outside space for the current and future occupiers of the property. As the dwelling already has a very modest garden, as well as being enclosed on each side by either the house or relatively tall boundary treatments, the proposal would lead to a confined form of development. This would result in a poor environment in terms of the outside space available. Therefore, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the current and future occupiers of the property.

6. Even if a four-bedroom dwelling could be created through alterations and extensions that would not require express planning permission, this would take a different form than the proposals subject to this appeal. Therefore, I give this factor limited weight and it would not outweigh the harmful effects of the development.
7. Considering the above, it is concluded that the proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the current and future occupants of the appeal dwelling. This would therefore not accord with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 18 of the Local Plan Part 2. These policies seek to retain and provide adequate and good quality, useable outdoor amenity space.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal dwelling is one of four two-storey houses of a similar design, located within a residential setting. The detailed design and spacing of these four properties varies, with the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring house, number 2, being link-detached. A single storey garage separates these houses from numbers 4 and 4A which are built close together, with only a narrow access gap between them. Between 2A and 4, there is both the attached garage to 2A and a similar narrow access gap. The area is not comprised of uniform building styles, with terraced housing opposite the site. Therefore, the gaps between neighbouring properties varies significantly.
9. The proposal consists of a two-storey side extension including conversion of garage to a habitable a room and extending to the rear wrapping around with the proposed single storey rear element. As the side extension is proposed to be set down from the main ridge as well as being set back from the front elevation, it would give the general appearance of being subservient to the host dwelling. Any terracing effect would not be dissimilar to that found in the immediate area.
10. The proposal would not meet certain criteria of Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2, including relating to the degree of set in from the side boundary. However, this was considered as acceptable through the previous appeal decision which was considered under a similar policy context. When considered in its particular context, this element of the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area or contrary to the aims of the development plan policies when they are considered as a whole.
11. For the reasons above, the side extension would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policy

DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2. Together, these Policies seek to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and to protect the character and appearance of the area. It would also accord with the overarching principles of Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2, which seeks to ensure that extensions to dwellings have no adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance and quality of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The lack of harm in respect of the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area would not mitigate or outweigh the harm in respect of the first main issue.
13. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR