
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3276419

33 Langley Crescent, Hayes UB3 5HN

- 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 Ms Audrey Bain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 52814/APP/2021/477, dated 5 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached property located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by two storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. The properties are relatively evenly spaced, of comparable scale and form, with uniform separation distances between them. No. 33 Langley Crescent (No. 33) has a two storey side extension with a hipped roof and a porch/single storey extension projecting from the front of the property.
4. The proposal would entail the construction of a single storey side extension with a mono-pitched crowned roof that would extend out up to the common shared side boundary with staggered form. It projects out in line with the existing mono-pitched single storey extension at the front of the property.
5. Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 states that extensions and alterations should be subordinate to the main dwelling and there should be no adverse cumulative impact on the character or appearance of the existing streetscene. Policy DMHD1 specifies all side extensions should be limited to less than half the width of the original property to avoid over dominance of the original house.
6. The proposed extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Equally, the closing of the gap between Nos. 31 and 33 at the side would

not appear out of character. From my site visit I noted a number of properties in the surrounding area that had modest scale extensions and garages that have been built to the side boundaries or in close proximity to such.

7. The scale and form of the proposed single storey side extension built in line with the front of the main house would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. In this case, the proposed single storey extension coupled with the existing two storey side extension would be more than half the width of the original property. The proposed extension would result in additional bulk at the side that would be out of character with the more modest form and appearance of the host building.
8. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Langley Crescent. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.
9. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the side extension has been carefully considered and redesigned in response to the previously refused scheme at the site¹ in order to take into account the character of the host property and minimise any impacts on the area. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the extension with the host property and the area, these aspects again do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to overall design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals, including residential extensions, will be of a high standard of design that appear subordinate to the main dwelling, harmonise with the local context and do not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character or appearance of the existing streetscene.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the single storey side extension at No. 23 Langley Crescent has different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with this other case.
12. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the development including the scheme's high quality design, making the efficient use of land and providing additional office accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

¹52814/APP/2020/3123

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR