
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2014

by JP Roberts BSc(Hons, LLB(Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 August 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/14/2222267

42 Camden Avenue, Hayes, Middlesex UB4 0PW

- 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 Govind Parmar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 16103/APP/2014/854, dated 14 February 2014, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2014.
 - The development proposed is single storey front/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The development had been carried out at the time that the application was made, and therefore I shall treat the application as one made under s.73 of the Act.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace two-storey dwelling in a long cul-de-sac of similar houses. Originally, the houses had recessed porches; those in mid-terrace had distinctive "keyhole" shaped openings, whilst end-of-terrace houses had rectangular openings. Since then, many of the houses have been fitted with flush fitting front doors, and there are several which have added external porches. There is some variety in the designs of porches in the road, with flat, ridged and hipped roofs in evidence.
5. The development in this case consists of an extension to the front of the house which has a monopitched roof, and a side extension with a flat roof. There is a dummy pitched roof in front of the flat-roofed side extension.
6. The extension is notably bigger than most of the front additions in the street. The Council's adopted Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) comments that front extensions are eye catching and change the face of the building, and says that they do not only affect the character and appearance of the building itself, but also the

street scene. The SPD requires that porches should not project past any bay, which this one does. Whilst the previous porch, which was damaged after being hit by a car, also projected forward, this is a larger extension and is therefore more dominant.

7. The SPD also says that porches should be subordinate in scale and form. It is certainly subordinate to the whole building, but it is nevertheless a bulky and discordant addition to the dwelling, with an awkward junction between the dummy pitched roof of the front extension and the flat roof of the side extension, which accentuates its incongruity. This conflicts with the SPD advice that changes and extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street.
8. Whilst I accept that there is some variation in the appearance of the fronts of houses in the street, I consider that the appeal example is unduly dominant and of poor design which is harmful both to the host building and to the street scene in general.
9. I have noted the several examples of other developments which the appellant has referred to me. Only one of those, on the opposite side of the road at 17 Camden Avenue, is in the same street, and that has a hipped roof which wraps around the corner of the building, unlike the appeal example. Moreover, I have not been told whether any of these other developments to which I have been referred have the benefit of planning permission, or if they have, whether they were approved after the adoption of the SPD. I therefore consider that they do not set a precedent for allowing this appeal, and nor are they so plentiful as to set any template for altering the character and appearance of the area.
10. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the development results in material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and that it conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) which seeks to protect and enhance the quality of the built environment. It also conflicts with saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (November 2012) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development harmonises with residential areas, the street scene and the host building. It also conflicts with the SPD to which I have referred above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

JP Roberts

INSPECTOR