
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232825
58 Boldmere Road, Eastcote HA5 1PS

- 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 Mark Kavanagh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 49427/APP/2019/1618, dated 14 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension, and replaced with a new single storey rear & side extension, two storey side extension, first floor rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling and is located on the corner of Boldmere Road and Chandos Road. The existing dwelling makes a positive contribution towards the sense of rhythm and the pattern of buildings along the Boldmere Road street scene, by maintaining a consistent building and roof design to neighbouring properties. In contrast the appeal property contributes towards an incongruous sense of enclosure within the Chandos Road street scene.
4. The appeal property encroaches within the predominant building line along Chandos Road, which in combination with its overall height and depth result in a detrimentally prominent feature within the street scene. The built extent of No 60 Boldmere Road, on the opposite corner of Boldmere Road and Chandos Road, contributes further towards this harmful enclosing effect, at odds with the predominant sense of spaciousness between buildings along Chandos Road.
5. The proposed first floor side and rear extension would increase the visual bulk of the host dwelling by further reducing the separation between the proposed dwelling and Chandos Road. It would also increase the built extent of the dwelling along this boundary, with the proposed height and depth of the extension exacerbating the existing sense of enclosure along this boundary.

Collectively these elements of the proposed side and rear extension would harmfully reduce the gap between the host dwelling and Chandos Road, which is the only spacious reprieve along this section of the Chandos Road street scene.

6. I note the appellant's suggestion that the proposal would improve the street scene by introducing a symmetrical balance with the dwelling at No 60, and would accord with parts of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions (SPD). Notwithstanding this, it would not justify increasing the harmful sense of enclosure along this section of Chandos Road. Limited weight has been given to the SPD, though was considered appropriate for assessment purposes in line with the general principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
7. The appellants have also referred to a number of examples of similar development in the wider area, but have provided limited details and information to support this claim. Based on the information submitted I am not satisfied that these cases are directly comparable to the appeal before me, and I cannot be certain of the circumstances which led to those proposals being accepted. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits and they do not outweigh the harm identified. I acknowledge that the main parties shared a consensus with the single storey rear extension and dormer window elements of the proposal, where located outside of the current setback to Chandos Road.
8. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (HLP): Part One – Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of HLP: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (saved September 2007) and the HDAS SPD (adopted December 2008). These policies and the SPD seek, amongst other things, to ensure development achieves high quality design which enhances the local distinctiveness of areas and harmonises with the street scene and surrounding development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR