

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2018

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3190180

88 Hyde Way, Hayes UB3 4PB

- 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 Mohinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application, Ref. 71064/APP//2017/2500, dated 10 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage. Construction of two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.
-

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 host dwelling; the semi-detached pair of Nos. 86/88, and the street scene of Hyde Way.

Reasons

3. The officer's report on the appeal application analyses the scheme in relation to a previous proposal dismissed on appeal. Whilst the current scheme resolves a number of the issues raised by its predecessor, the Council considers that the enlargement of the dormer window in the existing catslide roof and the large size of the dormer in the proposed extension would result in their domination of the roof slopes in which they sit.
 4. I agree with the Council's view that this would fail to respect the architectural integrity of the host dwelling; would not comprise secondary or subordinate additions in conflict with paragraph 7.5 of the Residential Extensions section of the Hillingdon Design & Access Statement (HDAS) 2008, and would set an unfortunate precedent for similar extensions and alterations to other properties in Hyde Way and its surroundings.
 5. I have noted the comments in the grounds of appeal that the set back of the extension's front elevation would achieve the required perception of subordination; that the scheme maintains the existing roof slope and that of the previous approval in 2016, and that the extension cannot closely match in with No. 86 because of the alterations already made to that property. I have additionally noted the references to extensions to Nos. 49/51; 74/76; 58/60,
-

and 29/31 in Hyde Way and accept that these and other examples comprise unsympathetic and inappropriate additions to the original dwellings.

6. However, whilst all these factors carry some weight and the appeal scheme would offer some improvements to the scheme dismissed on appeal, it is nonetheless my conclusion that they do not negate the essential validity of the Council's view that the large size and style of both dormers would be an unacceptable example of poor design.
7. This design flaw would fail to ensure that the proposed side extension sits comfortably as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling and reasonably in keeping with both it and the semi-detached pair, the unsympathetic extension of No. 86 notwithstanding. In addition to a harmful effect on the character and appearance of Nos. 88 & 86, the street scene would also be adversely affected.
8. Overall, the scheme would not be in accordance with the HDAS residential extensions guidelines and there would also be a consequential harmful conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies 2012; Policies BE13, BE15 & BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies 2012, and Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
9. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR