



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3282670

101 Castle Avenue, West Drayton UB7 8LQ

- 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 Tandeep Kaur Jhuti-Buch against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75148/APP/2021/1891, dated 10 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although the development proposed is described on the application form as 'Proposed 2 storey side extension and Porch', it appears that the porch element was removed during the course of the planning application and the original plans were superseded. The above description of development therefore better reflects the development proposed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling located on a highly prominent corner location. Surrounding properties are of a similar style and scale, with those in the immediate surroundings arranged around a formal area of open space. This original form and alignment of properties results in a clear sense of harmony and order.
5. The proposed development would extend into the existing garden area of the appeal site, elongating the terrace and unbalancing its appearance, which is currently emphasised by the evenly spaced position of window openings and chimneys along it.
6. By reason of the continuation of the existing roofline and front elevation, together with the additional width of more than half that of the existing dwelling, the proposed development would not appear as a later, subservient addition to the original property. As such the extension would not respect the hierarchy of the original terrace and would confuse its originally intended design.

7. The appellant contends that the extension of the building into its own garden would not impact on the open nature of the public green space onto which it faces. Whilst the public open space itself would no doubt remain open, it is the relationship of the proposed extension with the original house, and wider pattern of development, that would be detrimental to its character and appearance. The appellant contends that by not setting down, or back, the extension from existing features of the original property a sense of symmetry within the terrace would remain. As set out within the reasoning above, I disagree with this statement.
8. The appellant has made reference to several 'precedent' cases within the local area, illustrating two-storey side extensions. Whilst I do not have the full details of these cases before me, I can see from the photographs submitted in support of the appellant's argument that many of the examples have in fact been designed to appear as subservient to the original property. This has generally been achieved through the setback of front elevation or set down of ridge level. Moreover, none of the examples provided share the same immediate location or context with the case before me. Notably, appeal ref. APP/R5510/W/18/3214744, referenced within the appellant's grounds of appeal, is not comparable due to the differing design and context of the site.
9. I am aware that it is possible to identify some cases across the borough, even some close to the appeal site, where two-storey extensions exist without a sense of subservience to the original property. However, during my site visit I was able to identify several cases where such measures had been incorporated into the design of extensions and had consequently achieved a more appropriate appearance and comfortable relationship with their host dwelling.
10. The examples identified where no subservient design features had been incorporated into extensions only go to illustrate how this unbalances pairs or rows of terraces, to the detriment of their character and appearance.
11. Consequently, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, contrary to the relevant provisions of policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2012). The relevant provisions of these policies together require that developments, including extensions, are designed to the highest standard and that side extensions do not exceed half the width of the original property and are setback behind the main elevation.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Price

INSPECTOR