



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2024

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23.04.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3335656

60 East Avenue, Hayes, UB3 2HP

- 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 A Bhargava against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 2773/APP/2023/2559, dated 25 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2023.
- The development proposed is the erection of a two storey front extension and raising of ridgeline.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey front extension and raising of ridgeline at 60 East Avenue, Hayes, UB3 2HP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2773/APP/2023/2559, dated 25 August 2023, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary matters

2. Since it more accurately describes the appellant's intentions, I have adopted the description of the development used in the Council's decision notice rather than that seen in the original application form.
3. An access required site visit had been arranged but no-one was at home when I visited. I therefore conducted my inspection without entering the property. Having regard to the thrust of the Council's objection and the main issue I am satisfied that I saw everything I needed to see to make a full and appropriate assessment.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling set back a metre or so from the back of the footway and separated from it by a low brick wall. The intention is to extend at the front so that the dwelling's new front elevation would be at the back of footway. The ridge of the roof would also be raised.

6. The street runs on a south-west to north-east axis. At the southern end, one frontage is largely undeveloped being comprised of a recreational area. The opposite frontage is occupied by dwellings of a distinct suburban appearance. Beyond the appeal property the opposite frontage is comprised of a former municipal estate, with two storey terraces predominant. The mid-section of this part of East Avenue on its eastern frontage comprises an eclectic and not a particularly attractive mix of property types. These range from a short terrace of dwellings – all with single storey front extensions; two flat roofed dwellings or flats; a bungalow and a detached residential property with a steeply sloping roof with two front doors.
7. The appeal dwelling is sandwiched between one of the flat roofed properties and that with the two front doors. Both buildings are built on the back of footway, and the appellant proposes to follow suit. I see no objection to this in visual terms particularly since the design of the proposed new front elevation largely replicates that which already exists. The raised ridge would be no higher than that of the next-door property at No 58. The proposal, to my mind, would have very little impact on the street scene and if built the completed development would sit acceptably in its visual context.
8. I therefore conclude for the above reasons that the proposal would not result in harm to either the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. I acknowledge that the proposal does not strictly accord with some of the literal provisions of policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (DMP2) relating to front extensions. However, the proposal, if built, would not be perceived as an extension, but as a restructuring of the existing dwelling, which would not appear significantly different in the public realm to that which already exists. In these circumstances I consider that a departure from the provisions of this development plan policy is justified. The proposal, however, accords with the relevant provisions of DMP2 policy DMHB 11 in that it incorporates what I regard as the appropriate principles of good design.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested the imposition of some conditions. The suggested standard condition in respect of materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity and in the interests of certainty, it is necessary that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Other matters

10. The Council has referred to other development plan policies but those to which I have referred to are considered the most relevant in the context of this appeal.
11. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, including the recent planning history, but none is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my overall conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. ART/2023/FE60EA/EE; ART/2023/FE60EA/EL; ART/2023/FE60EA/PE; ART/2023/FE60EA/PL & ART/2023/FE60EA/SPLP.
3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.