
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2015

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 January 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/14/2229658

46 Whitethorn Avenue, West Drayton, Middlesex, UB7 8JZ

- 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 Nicola Scales against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 70030/APP/2014/3367 was refused by notice dated 17 November 2014.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 46 Whitethorn Avenue, West Drayton, Middlesex, UB7 8JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 70030/APP/2014/3367, 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 following approved plans: B3857 Site Location, B3857-01 & B3857-02A.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, angled corner, two storey dwelling with unadorned elevations and reasonable proportions. It is in a well established area of residential character having a relatively attractive suburban streetscene formed by terraced and semi-detached homes of broadly similar design and with a marked sense of openness stemming from the grassed and treed 'avenue' layout. The proposal is as described above and would provide for increased living and bedroom accommodation.

4. This corner plot is well set back practically and visually from the principal road frontage and junction by reason of the street's adjacent grassed triangle and tree growth. It can be seen from a number of angles but does not have the direct visual prominence of most corner plots. The appeal site narrows to the rear and in order to seek to accommodate a usable side extension and maintain a reasonable distance off the shared side boundary the proposal has had to reflect this by a tapering design towards the rear. This would make for a roof / gable end with an unusual form but one which I am confident in three dimensions would not look overly contrived or far removed from the cues set by the host property. Furthermore, other aspects of the extension would be well considered in that windows are shown as matching the existing types and scale and with a modest set back to the front elevation and ridge lower than the main property there would be some air of subordination for the extension as a whole. I noted that roofs vary locally between hipped and a gabled approach. By reason of siting and form this structure as a whole would not look alien in the immediate and wider context or detract from the pleasing streetscene and qualities of the host building; it would not be jarring on the eye.
5. I conclude that the development sought would not lead to visual detriment to the appeal property and the wider locality. It would not run contrary to the objectives of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). These policies, like the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: *Residential Extensions*, share common themes of seeking to protect or enhance the character and appearance of buildings and their neighbourhood, to ensure harmonious development and protection of local distinctiveness.

Conditions

6. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I agree that there should also be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Overall conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR