



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3300668

13 Hayes End Close, Hayes UB4 8HF

- 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 Sukhwinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 12748/APP/2022/167, dated 19 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side extension to dwellinghouse.
-

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 building and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is located at the junction of Hayes End Close with Hayes End Drive. For the most part, these streets are characterised by semi-detached dwellings of similar overall designs which are arranged on fairly consistent building lines set back from the streets. A few detached dwellings, including on the appeal site, add some diversity. However, the broadly similar height and proportions of these buildings and use of similar materials, design features and details including window arrangements to the semi-detached pairs means that they nevertheless sit comfortably as part of the street scene. The usually open frontages and spacing that is typically maintained between buildings at first floor level and above further provide for a degree of spaciousness in views along the street scenes, and an overall sense of rhythm and consistency to the character and appearance of the area which is distinctive.
4. The extension would infill much of the space between the dwelling and the boundary with Hayes End Drive at two-storey level. The appellant indicates that the development would be set in around 1m. Even so, it would still be much closer to the boundary with the street than is typical nearby. It would result in a significant reduction in openness on the site in comparison to the existing single-storey garage, and an unusual degree of enclosure to the street and junction. Moreover, while it would not project forward of the building line along Hayes End Close, the extension would be much closer to the street than the front of 2 and 4 Hayes End Drive which adjoin the site to the rear, and would

step notably forward of the general Hayes End Drive building line beyond these neighbours.

5. In these regards, the proposal would be contrary to the requirement within Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies 2020 ('LPP2') that side extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded. The increased height and scale of the extension means that its visual impact would be much greater than that of the existing single storey garage on the site, and I find that it would be a prominent and intrusive feature in views along Hayes End Drive.
6. In addition, the extension would be more than half the width of the host dwelling in further conflict with provisions of Policy DMHD 1, and the proposal also includes a fairly large increase in the height of the roof which the policy advises will not generally be supported. The extension would be of comparable depth to the host dwelling, and given the considerable increase in the height and overall bulk and mass of the dwelling that would result, I consider that the development could not reasonably be described as subordinate. Irrespective of the use of matching materials and the alignment of windows, I find that the development would dominate the appeal building to the detriment of its character, and it would stand out against the scale and proportions of other buildings nearby, particularly given the increase in height which would cause the roof to stand above surrounding dwellings. These factors would compound the visual impact and unsympathetic nature of the development, and I cannot agree with the appellant that the extension would be subservient.
7. I find for these reasons that the development would be a discordant and incongruous feature that would erode the spacious quality and distinctive pattern of its surroundings in a prominent location at the junction of Hayes End Close and Hayes End Drive.
8. The appellant has provided details of an extension to the appeal dwelling that was granted in 1984 which they assert is similar to the proposal before me. Although the appellant comments that the site circumstances have not changed since that approval, they acknowledge that there have been changes in policy. Furthermore, the plans provided of the previously permitted extension show that it would have been set down considerably from the main roof, resulting in an impression of subservience and a smaller bulk at the upper part of the building which would reduce the visual impact and effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area in comparison to the proposal before me. As a consequence, I do not find the previous permission to be a compelling justification to allow the appeal.
9. The appellant has also drawn my attention to permission granted for extensions elsewhere in Hayes. However, the side extension at 11 Ayles Road did not extend forward of the building line of the neighbouring properties or increase the height of the host building, and the extension at 106 Greenway is lower and of much smaller width than the host dwelling. Accordingly, their circumstances are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal, and I do not find that these examples offer meaningful support for the development before me.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area, and it would conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the LPP2. Amongst other things,

these policies together broadly seek good design, development that harmonises with the local context taking into account factors including building lines and setbacks and streetscape rhythm, and subordinate extensions that do not adversely affect the character, appearance or quality of the area.

Conclusion

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would make effective use of the site in accordance with objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') and the London Plan 2021, albeit that the development would comprise an extension to an existing dwelling rather than new housing. However, the Framework also includes requirements that development delivers well designed places that are sympathetic to local character and that add to the overall quality of the area, and for the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would not achieve those aims.
12. I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR