
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3301983

5 Albert Road, Hayes UB3 4HR

- 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 Mahijit Matharoo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 29834/APP/2022/792, dated 8 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and loft dormer conversion to include a hip to gable, rear dormer, side gable end window and 3 x front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses situated in a prominent position at the corner of Albert Road and North Hyde Road (A437). Both houses have hipped roofs and retain their original form and symmetry.
4. Whilst the side extension would be set back at first floor level, this would not prevent the hip-to-gable alteration from substantially altering the form of the host property and unbalancing the semi-detached pair. In addition, the rear dormer would subsume the majority of the roofspace at the rear of the property. Its size and box-like form would appear excessively large and out of keeping with the existing building. The result would be a scale and design of development which does not integrate sensitively with the host building. Moreover, these harmful effects would be readily apparent in open views from the south and west.
5. The neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses (Nos 9 and 11) have been extended on both sides, but this is with matching hipped roof extensions that respect the original form and symmetry of the pair, so they are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. 164 North Hyde Road has also been referred to by the appellant, but that too is of a different design and is not within the immediate context of the appeal site. In any event, I have considered the appeal on its own merits and I have found that the proposal would be harmful for its own specific reasons.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and so, conflicts with Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020); Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012); and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). Taken together, these require that new development, including extensions, respects the design and architectural composition of the original building; harmonises with the local context; and ensures that there is no adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.

Other Matters

7. The neighbour at No 7 raised concerns in relation to loss of privacy and light. These matters did not feature in the Council's refusal reasons and as I am dismissing the appeal for other substantive reasons, it has not been necessary to address these matters any further in this Decision.

Conclusion

8. Given the above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no considerations to outweigh this conflict. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR