



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3230021

42 Newcroft Close, Uxbridge UB8 3RJ

- 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 D. Thomas against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73836/APP/2019/499, dated 6 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property located at the end of a cul-de-sac within an established residential area. There is a mix of housing types along Newcroft Close, including detached 1.5 storey dwellings, small blocks of terraced houses and pairs of two-storey semi-detached properties. However, the end of the cul-de-sac is characterised by the symmetry in design and layout of the pair of semi-detached houses (Nos. 42 and 44) of which the appeal property forms part. This pair feature prominently in the street scene as they are positioned at the head of the cul-de-sac and so are visible in long views down Newcroft Close, which is a relatively straight road.
 5. The proposed development would result in a two-storey side extension with a gable end roof and a single storey front extension with a pitched roof which would project forward of the dwelling. The two-storey side extension part of the proposal would be similar to that which already has planning permission in that it would be set back from the front of the main house leaving the existing dwelling as the primary part of the property. However, when coupled with the
-

protruding ground floor porch extension, the proposal, as a whole, would appear to wrap around the original house. It would appear bulky and not be subordinate to, or coherent with, the main dwelling, which would detract from its appearance. This would destabilise the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which the appeal property forms part, and therefore harm the appearance of this end of the cul-de-sac and the street scene.

6. Whilst the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (the 'HDAS SPD') is only a guidance document, as highlighted by the appellant, I have had regard to its guidance on side and front extensions and found it relevant in this context.
7. I understand the appellants need for the development to house his extended family including his handicapped grandson, but I give little weight to these personal circumstances, particularly as the extant permission would appear to provide very similar accommodation to that now proposed.
8. I conclude the proposal would harm the established character and appearance of the area. I therefore consider that the proposed development conflicts with policies BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012), the HDAS SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the existing built form and the surrounding area in which they lie.

Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR