



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 May 2021

by L Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3269199

19 Lawn Avenue, West Drayton UB7 7AQ

- 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 H Virk against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75358/APP/2020/4075, dated 8 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is "Double storey Side Extension and Part single and Part Double storey Rear Extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During my site visit I noted that the garage and store shown on the existing plans had been demolished and works were underway on a side and rear extension. This has not affected my reasoning in reaching a decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached housing designs, ranging from bungalows and chalet style houses to larger two storey houses, most set within long plots, which create an attractive, well-spaced residential environment. The appeal site is a detached two storey house with front facing gable end, off-set to one side in its plot. There are a number of examples of first floor level dormers of various sizes on all elevations visible in the area; some make a positive contribution to the character of the area, whereas others have the opposite effect.
5. The single and two storey rear extensions that form part of the proposal already benefit from planning permission under a different scheme, which included a single storey side extension. The Council's objection to the proposal therefore relates to the two-storey side extension, which comprises a catslide roof following the existing roof plane with a side facing dormer.
6. The two-storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the house, with the dormer set in further from the front and rear elevations and back from the eaves. It would otherwise stretch the full width of the proposed

extension, with four side facing windows shown on the submitted plans to be obscure glazed.

7. Notwithstanding the presence of side facing dormers of various designs in the locality, the proposed dormer would be of poor design, adding uncharacteristic bulk to the appeal building which would be out of scale with the roof slope of the neighbouring house along this side boundary and entirely noticeable in the street scene. The side elevation of the proposed dormer would be utilitarian in appearance on account of the four obscure glazed windows, which would also be appreciable in views from the street. This would emphasise its awkward relationship with the neighbouring property and lack of quality in design, which would not relate well to the pleasant residential character of the area. The proposed dormer would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposed development would fail to comply with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Council's Local Plan: Part 1¹ and Policies DMHB1, DMHB5, DMHB11 and DMHB 12 of the Council's Local Plan: Part 2². These policies require, amongst other things, new development to improve the quality of the built environment through high quality design which enhances local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to the economic benefits created through the construction of the proposed development in the context of the country's COVID-19 recovery. Any such benefits would however be constrained by the scale of the development and the relatively short timescale of construction works. They would accordingly be outweighed by the far longer-term effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

L Douglas

INSPECTOR

¹ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012)

² Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020)