
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2016

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20th January 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/15/3134462

16 Seaton Road, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 1NS

- 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 Mrs Jasbinder Kooner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 5090/APP/2015/1595 was refused by notice dated 24 June 2015.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a part first floor rear extension at 16 Seaton Road, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 1NS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 5090/APP/2015/1595 dated 23 April 2015 and the plans submitted with it and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans on drawings: Site Location Plan, 2015/116/01, 2015/116/02, 2015/116/03, 2015/116/04 and 2015/116/05.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Policy BE1 in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One (2012) seeks a high quality of design. Policy BE15 in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2012) requires extensions to harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Policy BE13 requires new development to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of an area. Policy
-

BE19 seeks to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of an area.

4. The appeal dwelling lies within a primarily residential area comprising predominately semi-detached two-storey dwellings. There is a repetition of different designs of dwellings in the streetscene and dwellings are of similar proportions.
5. The appeal dwelling has been extended to include a rear dormer on a loft conversion, together with a side gable and a rear single-storey projection. The proposal includes a first floor rear extension over part of the existing single-storey rear projection. It would have a depth of 3.6 metres and a width of 3.6 metres. It would be set some 1.6 metres below the existing main ridgeline.
6. The rear of the original dwelling is currently dominated by the existing rear dormer and the single-storey flat roof rear extension. From my observations, due to the set down, scale and depth of the proposed extension, I consider it would appear as subservient addition and I do not consider that the cumulative additions would significantly adversely affect the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Thus, for the same reasons, I consider that the proposal would not adversely affect the appearance of the surrounding rear garden area. Therefore, the proposal would be in accordance with the above Local Plan policies.
7. Although I have determined the proposal before me on its individual merits, I recognise that there has to be continuity in decision making.
8. I have been made aware of proposed consented extensions to the adjacent dwelling at 18 Seaton Road. Ref 29506/APP/2015/79 is a Certificate of Lawful Development for a loft conversion, including a large rear dormer and hip to gable end conversion. Ref 29506/APP/2015/80 is planning permission for a part two-storey part single-storey rear extension. Ref 29506/APP/2015/1107 is the grant of Prior Approval for a 4 metre deep single-storey rear extension.
9. Although No. 18 is a house of different design, the proportions are similar to the appeal property. If these extensions were to be constructed, the rear of No. 18 would be very similar in design and scale to that proposed for the rear of No. 16. This is a material consideration.
10. For the above reasons and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I allow the appeal.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested standard time, materials and plans conditions. I consider such conditions to be reasonable and necessary.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR