
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022 by R Dickson BSc (hons) MSc

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3298620

6 Sunray Avenue, West Drayton UB7 7AH

- 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 Manjit Tamber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19303/APP/2021/4227, dated 11 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and internal changes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Sunray Avenue is a wide residential street with a high variation of house types. Nos 6 and 6A have similar features and are set further back than other houses on the street and are one pair of only a few houses that are semi-detached. No 6 is situated on a long and narrow plot, with the existing house taking up most of the width of the plot.
5. The proposed extension would substantially increase the ground floor area of the dwelling. It would extend the full width of the property and be significantly taller than the existing extension, rising to just below the first-floor windows. Although it would not be easily visible from the front of the property, by virtue of the depth, width and height of the proposal, it would nevertheless be a substantial addition which would appear of a different scale to the host property. Consequently, it would constitute a dominant and incongruous addition to the host building.
6. In comparison to the existing internal floor area, the proposed extension would be a substantial addition. The property would retain plenty of private garden space and would not be unduly large in relation to the plot as a whole, however the size and scale of the proposed extension would nevertheless appear out of

proportion with the host building. Therefore, it would not be subordinate to the host property.

7. The extension allowed at appeal at 66 Fairway Avenue¹, predates the policies of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies which was adopted in 2020, and which includes in Policy DMHD1 specific limits for the depth of single storey rear extensions. No 66 is set on a considerably wider plot than the appeal site and the allowed extension had a flat roof. As a result, it does not appear as bulky as the appeal scheme. The Inspector for that appeal also noted that there was a local pattern of large scale extensions in the area. Although Fairway Avenue is close to the site, the evidence before me is that properties there have been more significantly extended than around the appeal site. While there are many extensions on properties around the appeal site, I have not been directed to any which are of the height and depth proposed here. Consequently, the situation at No 66 is materially different to the appeal before me.
8. The appellant has referred to 6m deep single storey extensions being approved at various properties in the wider area. I do not have the plans, so do not know their height and scale in relation to the host properties. Nor do I have details of the circumstances under which these were considered acceptable. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that they are comparable to the proposal before me. Furthermore, they are some distance from the appeal site. Therefore, I do not find that these have established a pattern of development on Sunray Avenue which would materially change the character of that road. I therefore attach limited weight to these various approvals, and they do not justify the harm I have identified.
9. Accordingly, the proposed rear storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Local Plan Part 2 insofar as they require new extensions to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and harmonise with the local context.

Other Matters

10. There is an Article 4 Direction covering this area, meaning that this proposal requires express planning permission rather than being considered through an application for prior approval. While the appellant may consider this unjust, the imposition of such Directions is a matter for the Council and is not within my remit in considering this appeal.
11. The appellant has identified a need for a larger home to accommodate frequent visitors, however this would be a private benefit. As such, I afford it limited weight, and this matter does not outweigh the harm that the proposed extension would cause to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that outweigh the conflict with

¹ APP/R5510/D/15/3011639

the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR