



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 September 2021

by Gareth W Thomas BSc (Hons) MSc (Dist) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3275514

12 Hornbeam Road, HAYES, UB4 9EE

- 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 Mrs Dua Alfardan against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 56599/APP/2021/668, dated 19 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is Single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey end of terrace house that faces an attractive communal landscaped green before it turns its gable to the road. The property has been extended in the past by way of a two-storey rear extension and a long narrow single storey addition that runs along part of the original front gable. The proposal would see the continuation of the single storey extension to a point just short of the face of the property's side elevation.
4. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) requires amongst other things that new developments should be well-designed so that they enhance and contribute to the area in terms of form, scale and materials whilst respecting established street patterns. Furthermore, with regard to front extensions, alterations should be minor in nature and avoid extending across the entire frontage of properties.
5. Although the proposed extension would, on the face of it, be of modest scale, I consider that by extending across almost the entire width of the front elevation, the totality comprising the additional element coupled with the present front extension would be a dominant and incongruous feature that would be at odds with the simplicity of the original gable of the house.
6. I recognise that there are examples of front extensions at other properties in the area that occupy the full width of the frontages to those properties.

However, I consider those extensions to be well designed with good proportions that do not undermine the integrity of the original house designs. By contrast, the appeal proposal would appear as an architecturally weak element and given the already elongated appearance of the present single storey extension, would further accentuate the discordance that already exists. It would therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, which in turn would result in unacceptable harm to the character of the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find that the appeal scheme would be contrary to the design ambitions of the above policies.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR