



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3311240

3 Colne Avenue, West Drayton UB7 7AJ

- 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 Rashid Ghafuri against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref:18590/APP/2022/1286, dated 19 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension to 6.0m incorporating new side extension and forming full wrap around. Partial front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The block plan incorrectly identifies the appeal property. Full details of the proposed development are shown on the other plans and from my site visit I was able to fully assess the relationship with the neighbouring properties. As the appeal is to be dismissed this error does not affect the decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
 - 1) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - 2) the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Colne Avenue with particular regard to overbearing impact and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The semi-detached property is located at the end of Colne Avenue. Whilst there is a mixture of properties along the street, the semi-detached properties to the west, which the appeal property is part of, have a similar form and character. It is also part of the West Drayton Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).
5. Policy DMHB 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies requires within ASLCs development to reflect the character of the area and its original layout, and that alterations respect the established scale, building lines, height, design and materials of the area. With

- extensions to be subservient to and respect the architectural style of the original buildings.
6. The proposal would create a wrap-around extension. The projection to the rear beyond the existing single-storey extension to the other half of the semi, No.5, would be limited. Nonetheless, it would extend across the full width of the plot, up to the shared boundary with No.3 and infill the area to the side of the property. A smaller projection would also be added across the full width of the front elevation. Whilst all the elements are single-storey, they would substantially increase the scale of the property.
 7. Many of the properties in the locality have been extended with a variety of alterations including canopies or porches to the front, two-storey side extensions, and alterations to the roof and materials. Also generally, the properties have garages up to the side boundary.
 8. Individually the various elements of the proposal are found in the area. However, many of the proposed design details do not reflect the existing property. Features such as the use of high parapet walls are curious and would act to close the gap to the side of the property. To the front, the property's simple form would be covered at the ground floor level with the extension having different fenestration to the first floor. There would also be breaches to the criteria for extensions under policy DMHD 1 with regard to the depth of the rear projection, and the extent of the front extension.
 9. I acknowledge that the property has the capacity to accommodate extensions and alterations. Nevertheless, in this case, I find the extent of the development in combination with its form and detailing would change the property's appearance to its detriment, and in the context of the ASLC I find that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 10. The development would thereby conflict with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DHMD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). Together these seek to ensure that developments are of a high-quality design, do not adversely affect the character, appearance or quality of the area and within ASLCs respect the architectural style of the original buildings.

1 Colne Avenue

11. No.1 is positioned further forward than the appeal property. As a result, the majority of the side elevation to the extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. This would create a significant length of wall along the shared boundary. While it would be single-storey it would be taller than the existing garage which has a limited projection above the existing boundary fence. The side elevation is designed as a parapet wall which would extend beyond the roof of the extension adding to its scale and the wall would include a number of windows. Whilst the windows are high level, they would appear to align with the neighbour's conservatory windows. There would also be a taller parapet element in between the side and rear element which would have a notable presence. The appellant refers to the boundary treatment providing screening, although from the plans the side extension would extend along the boundary.

12. In my view, the proposal would appear excessive in scale and due to the proximity, design, and depth it would have an imposing and oppressive appearance which would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 1. It would therefore fail to accord with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) which require development proposals to achieve a satisfactory relationship with the adjacent dwelling and ensure that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has referred to three distinct characteristics of the West Drayton ASLC and I accept that the proposal would not directly affect these wider elements. However, this does not alter my findings with regard to the impact of the development on the property and its setting along Colne Avenue.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR