
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

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

Decision date: 7th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3163606
20A Bessingby Road, Ruislip HA4 9DA

- 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 Andrew Gray against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 72028/APP/2016/2472, dated 26 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is prominently located at the junction of Bessingby Road and Lynmouth Drive and includes an end-of-terrace, two-storey dwelling with pebbledash rendered walling under a tiled roof. The surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of similar age and style arranged in a grid-iron street plan. The proposed extension would wrap around an existing flat roofed, single-storey kitchen to the rear of the dwelling and adjoin the footway to Lynmouth Drive following removal of part of the boundary wall.
4. Paragraph 3.0 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions*¹ (SPD) states that a single-storey rear extension should be assessed against any possible detrimental effect on the character of the local area, and must include careful attention to the size, depth, height, location and overall appearance of the proposal. It goes on to advise that such extensions should be designed to appear subordinate to the original house and should not exceed 3.6m in depth where a semi-detached or terraced dwelling has a plot width of more than 5m. The appeal proposal would breach this threshold, and given its size and proximity to the boundary would not appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling.

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions* (2008)

5. The visually awkward juxtaposition between the extension and the existing dwelling would result in a cramped form of development adjacent to the footway, and would unacceptably impose on the street scene to the detriment of its visual amenity. Moreover, the proposal would impinge on the building line of properties on Lynmouth Drive, further diminishing the sense of openness on this prominent corner site and the gap between built development. The retention of the bushes to the side of the dwelling would provide only very limited screening of the extension from Bessingby Road, and visual benefits arising from removal of the parapet to the kitchen to accommodate a new roof would be modest. These measures would not overcome my concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the street scene.
6. In coming to these findings I have taken into account extensions to other properties in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. Some do not involve corner plots. Others are of unfortunate appearance and do not constitute examples of sympathetic development in a residential area, and do not therefore justify the appeal proposal. Furthermore, it is unclear whether some of these extensions pre-date the current development plan and the SPD.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Part 1 of the Local Plan² which, amongst other things, requires a high quality of design in all new extensions that enhances the local distinctiveness of the area. It would also be contrary to those parts of saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Local Plan (Part 2)³ which seek to ensure that extensions harmonise with the street scene and the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building, and complement or improve the amenity and character of the area.
8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal should fail.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector

² Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)

³ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (2012)