

2 Adelphi Crescent Hayes - Appeal by Mr Khurana Khajinder Singh against the refusal of planning permission by Hillingdon Council for the – “Single storey side/rear extension (following demolition of the existing side and rear extension); removal of first floor side window and new first floor rear window” – Planning reference 36075/APP/2022/2551

1.0 Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The appeal proposal relates to a two storey semi-detached house one of a pair with No. 4 at the junctions with Weymouth Road. A single storey garage and storage shed exists on the west side of the dwelling flanking Weymouth Road. The area is residential in character and comprises of pairs of semi-detached houses.
- 1.2 The site is not situated within a Conservation Area nor are there any Listed Buildings in close proximity of the site.
- 1.3 The site is not in a designated flood risk zone.
- 1.4 There are no trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the site or on adjoining land.

AERIALVIEW



FRONT VIEW FROM ADELPHI CRESCENT



SIDE VIEW FROM WEYMOUTH ROAD



VIEW FROM JUNCTION WITH WEYMOUTH ROAD



2.0 Appeal Proposal

2.1 The application subject of this appeal (ref 36075/APP/2022/2551) is for single storey side/rear extension (following demolition of the existing side and rear extension); removal of first floor side window and new first floor rear window. This was refused on the following grounds:

1. *The proposed single storey side/rear extension, by reason of the prominent siting, combined height, depth and excessive width, bulk and massing would result in a dominant, excessive, bulky and unsympathetic and disproportionate addition that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the*

context of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the prominent corner siting location, street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

2.2 Refusal documents are attached to this statement.

3.0 Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

3.1 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that there should be a 'presumption in favour of **sustainable** development'. Local planning authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development. They should pro-actively look to drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, businesses and industry, infrastructure and thriving local places that the UK requires.

Hillingdon Local Plan Policies.

3.2 In the case of the appeal proposal, the relevant policies that was deemed to be contravened according to the refusal reasons are

Policy BE1 (Built Environment), of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One.
Policies DMHB 11 (Design of New Development) and DMHB 12 (Streets and Public Realm) DMHD 1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

4.0 Statement of Case

4.1 The appeal proposal was refused for the reasons stated in paragraph 2.1 above.

4.2 The appellant's would argue that the design of the proposed side extension would be compatible with and subordinate to the existing house. This is modest extension which would have a pitched sloping roof to match existing house and would be constructed in matching materials.

4.3 The appeal site also does not constitute a visually important area of open space at this corner plot. Instead the site comprises existing developed land containing a single storey garage and storage structures visible from the pavement and public highway which does not make a positive contribution to the streetscene.

4.4 The council's argument that the appeal proposal would adversely impact on the *"visual amenities of the prominent corner siting location, street scene and the surrounding area"* does not in the appellants view carry any material weight. The parcel of open land sited immediately to the front (south and south-west) of the proposed area of the side extension would remain and would not be affected by the proposal which would reflect the similar open spaces at the four corners of this junction. Therefore the appeal proposal would not affect the openness and visual amenities of this corner plot.

4.5 In relation to the rear sections of the proposal, it is noted that the Planning Officer has accepted the principle of the rear extension. The delegated report states

"Turning to the rear, the ground floor rear element, on balance, in terms of the projection would be at the point of acceptability in terms of massing and proportion. Furthermore, the rearward projection has already been considered as being acceptable".

4.6 It is noted that the Planning Officer's report states that

"The addition would negatively impact the character and appearance of the context. If the current scheme (or any of the approved schemes) were to be implemented alongside the current live scheme for an outbuilding, this would reduce the amount of useable rear private amenity space to an unacceptable standard to which further demonstrates the excessively sized nature of the proposal."

4.7 However the appellants would state that the above argument is purely hypothetical given that the approved schemes have not been implemented on site. The current appeal proposal if granted would offer the appellant the flexibility to implement a scheme based on the appellants financial and personal circumstances.

4.8 It is considered that the proposed development considered on its merit would not materially increase the scale and bulk of the development at this site. The development would appear as a subordinate development and would not dominate the site and the surrounding two storey developments. The proposal would provide an acceptable development solution to this site

4.9 The new development would still be single storey, but compared to the existing it would be an improvement, and in that respect, it would make positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene.

4.10 For above reasons it is considered that the design of the appeal proposal is acceptable and would not cause harm to the character of the area or the streetscene.

5.0 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 For the reasons stated above the Planning Inspector is respectfully requested to allow the appeal.