

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2015

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 July 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/15/3015609

14 Airdrie Close, Hayes, Middlesex, UB4 9SR.

- 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 Arkadiusz Jachim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 70406/APP/2014/3887, dated 25 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2015.
 - The development proposed is a single storey ground floor side extension with a new porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey ground floor side extension with a new porch at 14 Airdrie Close, Hayes, Middlesex, UB4 9SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 70406/APP/2014/3887, dated 24 November 2014, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0-1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Appeal site is located within a modern residential estate that is characterised by two storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings from a limited palette of designs and materials. In particular the dwellings have dormer windows and porches with a mixture of hipped and gable roofs and their front elevations include a combination of brick, tile hanging and render.
-

There are pitched roof single and pairs of garages to the sides of the dwellings whose building lines vary. Some are set back from the front building lines and others project forward of the main front building lines and are attached to the front porches.

4. The Appeal property is located at the end of a small cul-de-sac and there is an uncharacteristically large gap between the Appeal dwelling and the dwelling at 15 Airdrie Close. Within this gap is a pair of garages which, again uncharacteristically are set back behind the rear building line of the Appeal dwelling. At the same time the Appeal dwelling is the only dwelling in the road with a side, as opposed to a front entrance porch. Notwithstanding these differences the dwelling and garages respect the overall design and materials used throughout the estate and thus blend in appropriately with the street scene.
5. Collectively policies BE13, BE15 & BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan – Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (UDP) requires new development to harmonise with the original building and the street scene. It should complement or improve the amenity or character of the area. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (Strategic Policies) similarly requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. It should be designed to be appropriate to the identity and context of Hillingdon's buildings.
6. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that new development should respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials.
7. The proposed single storey extension would be in line with the front building line of the dwelling in accordance with the advice given in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Strategy Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (SPD). Contrary to the advice given in the SPD the extension would slightly exceed 2/3 of the width of the host dwelling and its height would slightly exceed 3.4 metres. However, the width of the extension would be comparable in width to a single garage and it would neatly fill the gap between the existing garage and the dwelling. In addition, the pitch of its hipped roof would respect that of the host dwelling and the adjacent garage building and it would logically sit immediately below the eaves line of the host dwelling. At the same time the proposed front porch would respect the siting, design and materials of the existing front porches within the estate.
8. Accordingly, whilst the proposed extension would not comply with some of the advice set out in the SPD, it would comply with the objectives of the advice; namely to ensure extensions respect, reflect and appear subservient to the host dwelling and the street scene.
9. The proposed extension would be deeper than the host dwelling. However, it would be located in a discrete position at the end of the cul-de-sac where the side elevation would only be visible in very limited views. Where it could be seen the proposed extension would be set against and below the flank elevation of the host dwelling and it would sit comfortably between the host dwelling and the existing garage building.

10. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would be visually subservient to the host dwelling and would both respect and reflect the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the estate as a whole. Accordingly the scheme would comply with policies BE13, BE15 & BE19 of the UDP, policy BE1 of the Strategic Policies, the NPPF and the objectives of the SPD.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR