



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3273211

7 Croft Close, Hayes UB3 5NE

- 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 Davinder Jandu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 25529/APP/2020/4191, dated 16 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and rear extension above existing ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side and rear extension above an existing ground floor extension at 7 Croft Close, Hayes UB3 5NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 25529/APP/2020/4191, dated 16 December 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 plans: 1094-1 Location and Block Plans, 1094-10 Proposed First Floor Plan, 1094-11 Rev. A Proposed Elevations, 1094-12 Proposed Roof Plan, 1094-15 Existing and Proposed Site Plan, 1094-18 Proposed Loft Floor Plan
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached house. The roof space has been extended by way of a hip to gable conversion and a rear dormer. There is also a first floor rear extension that has a somewhat unusual appearance in that it sits narrowly on part of the wrap around single storey extension that the

- property also contains. The first floor rear extension also appears to project off the dormer.
4. Croft Close is a cul-de-sac which consists of similarly designed semi-detached properties, albeit some have been the subject of extensions. The appeal property is sited at an angle at the end of the cul-de-sac. As a result of this arrangement and because the first floor side element of the proposal would be well set back from the front elevation and lower in height than the main roof ridgeline, it would appear subservient when viewed from the streetscene.
 5. From the rear, the proposal would clearly be more apparent. With its proportions, it would not though result in an unpleasing appearance as it would give rise to a more cohesive form. The plot itself widens from its frontage to the rear of the property and beyond. Thus, it would ably accommodate the proposal, even though the overall width would be similar to that which would have been found on the original house.
 6. The proposed crown would constitute a modest part of the roof and would be sited centrally, as viewed from the rear. It would also be well set off the boundaries with the neighbouring properties in respect of its restricted wider visibility. It would not be readily visible from the streetscene.
 7. With regard to in-combination effects to the rear with the existing extensions, the property already bears little resemblance to what would have been the original house. As a consequence, whether or not the addition of the proposal would appear as a subordinate addition at the rear has a limited bearing. Overall, it would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and the locality.
 8. Concerning the exerts of the previous appeal decision¹ on the site that I have been referred to, the Inspector considered those extensions would have resulted in an awkward visual mismatch wholly at odds with the character and appearance of the original property. I am not persuaded this applies to the proposal before me on account of its design. It would result in a more comfortable appearance as it would be viewed from other houses and gardens. I am satisfied that the circumstances are sufficiently different so that the findings of that previous appeal decision do not change my conclusion.
 9. The Planning Officer Report refers to Policy DMHD 1 of the Council's Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) (Local Plan Part 2), although it does not feature in the reason for refusal. There would not be a particular conflict with this policy because the proposal would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and as matters in relation to a subordinate addition are not decisive in this case. Whilst I acknowledge the detailed approach that this policy provides, the site circumstances also need to be borne in mind and so such matters do not overall count against the proposal.
 10. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. As such, it would comply with Policy BE1 of the Council's Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) and with Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 where they are concerned with a high quality of design, including extensions, which enhances

¹ Council planning application ref: 25529/APP/2014/3391

the local distinctiveness of the area and harmonising with the local context by taking into account width and rooflines, amongst a number of other detailed considerations.

11. The reason for refusal also refers to Policy DMHB 1 of the Local Plan Part 2. As this relates to heritage assets which is not applicable to the proposal, I have not considered this policy any further.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would be set off the boundaries with the neighbouring properties and so would not cause unacceptable effects in relation to light and overshadowing, as well as on the enjoyment of the gardens. In addition, the Planning Officer Report confirms that the proposal would meet the Council's 45 degree rule. No windows are proposed that would directly overlook the properties on either side and so privacy levels would also be adequately maintained.
13. In relation to construction effects from what is a householder development, any disruption should be limited and for a short duration only. The permission itself goes with the land, not the appellant, and so the personal aspects associated with construction are not for my consideration. The same applies as regards the effect on property values.

Conditions

14. In addition to the timescale for implementation, I have imposed a condition concerning the approved plans which detail the proposal. This is for the purposes of certainty. I have also imposed a condition by way of the external materials to match the existing building. This is in order to protect the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR