



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2022

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MScTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3293750

15 Varcoe Gardens, Hayes UB3 2FF

- 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 Gurcharan Singh Chopra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76805/APP/2021/3784, dated 8 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end terrace dwelling within a modern planned housing estate. These particular terraced blocks are formed by an arrangement of different house types, punctuated in places by driveways that lead to small parking courtyards at the rear. It is notable that the end terrace dwellings are all the same house type with a regular dual-pitched gable end presented to the driveway. This pattern of development and the resultant symmetry at the driveway entrances is a distinctive characteristic of the street scene.
4. The proposal is for a full-width, two-storey rear extension. The design includes an unconventionally shaped roof containing a flat-roofed middle section. Although this roof form is reflective of some of the mid terrace house types, it would fundamentally alter, rather than respect, the original design of this end terrace property. Moreover, unlike the mid terrace properties, the full side elevation of the appeal property would be visible from the street where its profile would appear markedly at odds with the other end terrace dwellings, and in particular, would adversely affect the planned symmetry with No 13 at the driveway entrance. These harmful effects would not be mitigated by the use of matching materials.
5. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and street scene, and so, conflicts with design requirements of Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) (the DMP), and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic

Policies (2012). Among other things, these require that new development, including extensions, respects the design of the original house; harmonises with the local context; and ensures that there is no adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area. The development is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, where it seeks to achieve well designed places and development which adds to the overall quality of the area.

6. The Council has also referenced DMP Policy DMHB12 (Streets and Public Realm) in the refusal reasons, but I do not consider it to be relevant to the appeal scheme. In addition, the appellant has referred to various Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan policies, but those policies were replaced by the DMP (2020) so are no longer part of the development plan for the area.

Other Matters

7. The Council's officer report states that the size of the rear garden would be reduced to less than half of that required to serve a 4-bed dwelling. However, my reading of Policy DMHB18 is that the private outdoor space standards should only be applied to "new residential development and conversions". To my mind, it would be reasonable to expect that there would be some reduction thereafter as a result of householders extending their homes. Indeed, DMP Policy DMHD1, which relates specifically to householder extensions, simply requires that 'vi) adequate garden space is retained'. In this case, I am satisfied that the remaining garden area would still be adequate for the needs of the occupiers, such that there would be no harm arising in this regard. However, this does not alter or outweigh the harm I have found in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

8. Given the above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no considerations to outweigh this conflict. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR