



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3299222

112 Central Avenue, Hayes UB3 2DA

- 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 Savinder Singh against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 45040/APP/2021/4508, dated 12 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single storey extension and erection of two storey part single flank extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end dwelling in a short row of six terraced houses. The terrace block has a continuous pitched roof with both gable ends being highly visible from the street. There are three pairs of distinctive front gable projections across the terrace, each containing the main front entrance doors. This gives the terrace a distinctive and pleasing balanced appearance that positively contributes to the street scene within this part of the Central Avenue Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).
4. The proposal would add a prominent two storey side extension with a hipped roof form and cat slide to the rear slope. This would fail to harmonise with the distinctive gabled roof forms associated with the terrace. Although it would be stepped down and subservient in height to the host property, its width would be wider than the part of the dwelling that is stepped back from the front projecting gable. This greater width would appear a disproportionate addition.
5. To the front, the smaller size of the first floor window would contrast with the size of the other existing first floor windows. Moreover, there would be a noticeably larger gap between the ground floor window and door, compared with the other ground floor openings. In addition, the proposed repositioning of the front door away from the front projecting gable would further disrupt the attractive balance to the terrace group. The combination of these matters would result in an extension that would appear contrived at the end of the terrace group to the detriment of the character and appearance of the ASLC.

6. The appellant has referred me to several extensions that the Council have granted nearby. The houses in the opposite terrace have different wall finishes and some have porches. I have no firm details of whether these were completed under permitted development rights or through planning applications, but they do underline how incremental alterations can erode the overall cohesive balance of the group. In this instance, the proposal would be a much larger addition than the porches and the circumstances are not directly comparable.
7. Other examples of extensions in Hesa Road, are outside of the ASLC. Moreover, the extension at 12 Hesa Road, although a large addition to the side, has a pitched roof and gable that reflects the character of the original terrace group and retains the characteristic of the front entrance door within the gable frontage projection. This contrasts with the proposal before me. The extension at 43 Hesa Road has a hipped roof and sits flush with the front building line of the terrace, in doing so it harmfully alters the composition of the terrace group. I do not therefore consider that these alterations justify an erosion of another terrace group, particularly given the appeal site's location in the ASLC.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the requirements of Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB1, DMHB5, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), insofar as they are relevant to this main issue. These require, amongst other things, that all development, including extensions be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including harmonising with the local context.
9. The absence of harm in relation to other matters, including other criteria of policies in the development plan, are neutral matters that weigh neither for nor against the proposal. They do not, therefore, outweigh or overcome my concerns in relation to the main issue.
10. The appellant has made changes to their scheme following the refusal of earlier planning applications with the view to finding a solution. However, this is not a matter for my consideration in this appeal and I am only able to make my decision considering the plans that were before the Council when they made their decision.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR