



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3326037

5 Greencroft Avenue, Ruislip HA4 9JG

- 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 P Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 8956/APP/2023/885 dated 23 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single storey and part double storey side and rear extension, loft conversion with dormer to the rear and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on the east side of Greencroft Avenue, in a short section between the junction with Ferncroft Avenue and Broadhurst Gardens, and within a predominantly residential area. There are predominantly semi-detached properties in the vicinity, of varying designs although the scale and massing of the individual and groups of pairs is broadly similar. The spacing between the pairs of properties varies but the spacing is particularly generous between the appeal property and its neighbour to the south which turns the corner into Broadhurst Gardens.
4. The existing property appears to have been built with an original smaller two storey, stepped side extension set back from the main front elevation with its large bay frontage. This is also seen on the adjoining semi-detached neighbour which has subsequently been further extended. The appeal property has a covered car port / storage area to the side.
5. The proposal would introduce a wider two storey extension to the side, brought further forward although still set back from the existing front with a smaller single storey extension to the side boundary. The extension would wrap around the rear of the house at ground floor level, with a partial first floor extension over part and a rear dormer addition. There would be a front porch addition.

6. I consider that the width of the two storey side extension would be uncomfortably wide in relation to the width of the existing dwelling, and its over prominence would be exacerbated by the width of the roof ridge in relation to the main roof of the existing property. I have noted the set back from the front elevation as well as the set down from the ridge line, but the proposal would still appear both overly wide and dominant in relation to the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling. The Appellant has contended that the existing side car port/ store should be regarded as contributing to the width of the existing property, but it would not appear to be part of the original property; is single storey only and is lightweight in appearance compared with the over prominence of the proposed addition.
7. The property would appear over-extended in relation to the existing house and the pattern of development in the vicinity. I agree that the property sits on one of the more generous plots, in terms of width, but the additional width of the plot and relationship with the neighbouring property at No 7 would not enable the overprominent addition to the existing house to be readily assimilated into the street scene.
8. Because of the spacing to the adjoining pair of semi-detached properties, including No 7 Greencroft Avenue, which turns the corner into Broadhurst Gardens, the side of the appeal property is particularly visible in street scene views. The over dominance of the side extension and its complicated roof form would be very visible in these street scene views and would further detract from the character and appearance of the local area.
9. I agree that there would be no terracing effect given the space that would remain to the side boundary at first floor level above and because of the layout of the adjoining property at No 7. Although substantial in scale and extent, I also consider that, taken on their own, the proposed extensions at the rear would be acceptable; the ground floor extension would be of uniform massing and design to replace the existing range of smaller extensions and the first floor addition would be appropriately set in from the side, together with a subservient roof form in relation to the main roof. Furthermore, the proposed dormer, taken on its own would be appropriately set within the roof slope. However, these findings would not outweigh the harm I have found from the width and massing of the proposed two storey side extension.
10. I have noted that the property at No 3 has been further extended but I do not consider that the proposal would introduce symmetry to the pair, as it would appear to be suggested by the Appellant. The proposal before me would bring two storey development much further forward in relation to the adjoining property at No 3 and would remain an overly prominent extension in relation to the semi-detached pair.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing property as well as of the local area. This would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework with particular reference to Section 12, all of which amongst other things, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

12. The Appellant has drawn my attention to an extract from a pre-app response from the Council for a part single and part double storey extension at the appeal site in September 2021 and a full copy of that response is included with the appeal documentation. However, the Council was clear in that pre-application response that whilst the principle of the proposed extension was not at issue, detailed concerns were raised with those scheme proposals, leading to a conclusion that it was unlikely to be supported by the Council. The Council therefore appears to have been consistent in its advice.
13. My attention has also been drawn to an appeal decision which granted permission for an extension at a property in the vicinity at 67 Ferncroft Avenue in 2015 under the Reference: APP/R5510/D/15/3002988. Whilst each proposal must be judged on its individual merits, I have nonetheless taken this scheme and permission into account and looked at it during my site visit. However, it does not seem to me comparable with the proposal before me in terms of the proposed configuration of the extension in relation to the existing property. It does not therefore lead me to a different view.
14. I have sympathy with the family related reasons for seeking a larger home. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that this objective could not be achieved in a manner which would at the same time respect the character and appearance of the dwelling and of the local area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR