

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3154380

46 Dawlish Drive, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 9SD

- 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 Raouf Meshreky against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 49706/APP/2015/3668, dated 2 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace 2-storey house which is located in a residential street comprising properties of similar age and appearance. Like a large proportion of the neighbouring houses the appeal property includes a full-width single-storey rear addition.
 4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a Victorian-style conservatory to the rear of the existing extension with a roof ridge that would extend above the level of the flat-roofed existing addition. Whilst the proposed conservatory would be roughly centrally positioned, and therefore set away from the side boundaries, it would extend a significant distance into the rear garden and beyond the prevailing rear building line that has been established over the years through extensions to the terrace. This rear protrusion, together with the height of the proposal, would result in an incongruous and discordant addition that would be out of keeping with the host property and terrace of which it forms part.
 5. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its siting and size, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to comply with Policy BE1 of the *Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies* (2012) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the *London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary*
-

Development Plan Saved Policies 2007. Taken together these policies seek to ensure that development harmonises with the original building and that it complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.

6. I note that the appeal proposal has sought to overcome the reasons given for the refusal of an earlier proposal for a larger conservatory located next to a side boundary (ref: 4906/APP/2015/1801). I am satisfied that, by virtue of its siting, the proposal before me would not have unacceptable effects on the living conditions of neighbouring residents in respect of loss of natural light or outlook and in some respects the proposal therefore accords with the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions* (2008). However this does not outweigh my concerns set out above.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR