

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2017

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3168032

87 Bideford Road, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 0UE

- 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 and Mrs A Lo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 25683/APP/2016/3307, dated 7 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and two storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a two storey addition to the side of the property that would extend significantly beyond the rear elevation of the house. Because this is a corner property, although the works would be set in from the boundary, the side facing elevation would be extremely prominent within the street scene. The lack of any relief in the substantial mass of the new works and the absence of any significant architectural detail or interest in this elevation would result in it having a particularly poor appearance. As this elevation would be highly prominent and would dominate this corner site, it would detract from the character and appearance of the area and would represent poor design.
 4. The reason for refusal refers to the virtual loss of an important gap characteristic and its resultant cramped appearance. As this is a corner plot, I am not satisfied that the proposal would appear cramped. It would extend beyond the building line of the properties to the south-west but it is a considerable distance from these and would not be viewed in the same context. Other properties are also built close to the side boundaries of corner plots and in that respect, I do not find the position of the works to be unacceptable. I agree that the design follows the form of the dwelling and as such, it may be acceptable in circumstance where the side elevation would not be so publicly visible and dominant.
-

5. Although I do not agree with the Council's concern with regard to the impact on the openness of the immediate area, I do agree with their analysis that the extension would not constitute a subordinate or sympathetic addition to the existing dwelling. It would not be in keeping with the character or appearance of the surrounding area because of the dominance, design and scale of its side facing elevation.
6. As the proposal would represent poor design in this particular context, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 and saved Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan 2007. As these policies generally accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight. I find no support for the proposal from the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions 2008.
7. I have had regard to the other extensions referred to by the appellants. Generally, they are not directly comparable. The extension at 41 Bideford Road has some similarities although its design differs and in particular, its depth is not as great as the proposal before me. I am unaware of when it was approved or the circumstances that led to its development but it does not represent a positive feature within the area or a good reason for accepting this proposal. In any event, I must consider this development on its own particular merits. Overall, the matters put forward by the appellants are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR