



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3281535

13 Burndell Way, Hayes UB4 9YF

- 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 S Vaid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74775/APP/2021/1422, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front and side wraparound extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the period between the Council's determination of the planning application and the submission of this appeal, the Government published¹ a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The parties have had the opportunity during the course of this appeal to comment upon the implications of the revised Framework to their respective cases. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the current Framework.
3. I have adopted the slightly more detailed development description, as used by the Council in the decision notice and the appellant in appeal submissions, in the header above. I am satisfied that neither party would be disadvantaged by my doing so and I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located in a prominent corner plot location within Burndell Way, at its junction with Wepham Close, and within a predominantly residential setting. The wider residential development is characterised by small, but largely open-plan property frontages, and a tight and relatively intimate built form.
6. The appeal property effectively has two street frontages; a flank elevation facing towards Wepham Close and in direct line with the approach along Burndell Way and a front elevation facing north towards Burndell Way.

¹ 20 July 2021

Although I am advised that the nature of the property's garden frontage to both streets has changed over time, it nevertheless retains an open-plan layout. Moreover, the space around the appeal property, combined with the dense shrub and tree belt on the northern side of the street, provides something of a breathing space from the otherwise tighter built form of Burndell Way.

7. The proposed wrap-around extension would subsume the existing property's ground floor front and (western) flank elevations, and amount to a substantial increase in floor area, to what is a modest detached dwelling. When viewed from the east on approach from Burndell Way, the extension's substantial depth and very shallow roof pitch would combine to create an incongruous and disproportionate form of extension. Furthermore, the flank wall would align with that of the existing property, resulting in a substantial and unbroken ground floor flank elevation. With no set-back or relief, the result would be a starkly incongruous form of development at odds with the modest scale and proportions of the existing property.
8. From Burndell Way, the extension would extend across not just the whole width of the existing front elevation, but additionally also the equivalent width of a previously approved extension on the western flank elevation. The result would be an excessively large, wide and dominant extension, out of keeping with the modest proportions of the existing property. Whilst I am mindful of the previously approved single storey extension on the property's west-facing elevation, that is an altogether more modest structure and would be discretely sited at the side of the property. In contrast, the appeal proposal would dominate the property in an incongruous, obtrusive and inappropriate manner.
9. Turning to the surrounding area, the sweep of the highway means that the front corner of the extension would be sited very close to the back edge of the footpath. It would also occupy a significant portion of the plot frontage facing north on to Burndell Way.
10. The open sweep of the appeal property's corner plot location and double street frontage location give the appeal property a more spacious frontage than many in the surrounding area. Combined with the dense landscaping buffer to the north of Burndell Way it provides something of a breathing space from the tighter built-form and grain found elsewhere within the development, notwithstanding the presence of the DIY superstore beyond the Burndell Way development. The proposed extension would significantly erode this sense of openness, the effects of which would be compounded by the prominence of the appeal site's location.
11. For these reasons, the proposed extension would be an unduly dominant addition to the appeal property which would relate poorly to the existing house in terms of its overall scale and proportions. By virtue of the extension's position on the house, and the prominent location of the house itself, it would also fail to harmonise with the local context and have an adverse impact on the character and appearance on the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan: Part 1 (LP1) policy BE1 and Local Plan: Part 2 (LP2) policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 which together seek to secure development of the highest quality which takes account of local context and character and which relate well to the host property.

12. I accept that there are instances of properties being located close to their plot / highway boundaries, most notably 18 Burndell Way for which I have been provided with details² by the appellant, but also other properties in the surrounding area³. However, having carefully considered their relationships with the street and nearby houses, and effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, I am not persuaded that they, or their context, are directly comparable with the appeal proposal.
13. I am also mindful of the somewhat unusual layout of the appeal property within the development. The twin street frontages, orientation of the property within its plot and the layout of its private garden space to the side are relatively unusual but not so restrictive, I conclude, as to justify the development in its proposed form. Whilst the house stands somewhat alone within this part of the Burndell Way streetscene, its prominent position and setting within the wider streetscene mean that the excessive scale and harmfully incongruous nature of proposed extension would be widely and detrimentally felt.
14. Although the Council have referred to the loss of a landscaped area, I noted that the Wepham Close frontage was in use for the parking of vehicles at the time of my visit. Nevertheless, both that area and the grassed area fronting Burndell Way contribute to the sense of openness at this point, which the proposed extension would erode. I accept that the proposal would retain a lawned area at the front, but this would not be sufficient to negate the harmful impacts of the proposal as set out above.

Other Matters

15. I can understand the appellant's reasons for wanting to extend the property and have noted the comparisons of existing floorspace with those required for new properties as set out in the '*Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard*'⁴. However, although it is not clear whether this comparison takes into account the previously approved side extension in calculating gross internal floor area (GIA), those standards apply to new dwellings, not in retrospect to existing dwellings and so I give this matter limited weight.
16. I have also noted that the Council do not object to the proposal in terms of any impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the extent of private outdoor amenity space that would be retained or on car parking provision. These are, however, only neutral effects and weigh neither in support of, nor against, the proposal.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR

² LPA Ref No: 57285/APP/2015/1952

³ Nos. 1, 3 and 20 Burndell Way

⁴ Department for Communities and Local Government