The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3234612
360 Bath Road, Heathrow UB7 0DH

- 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 Edwin Younis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 13135/APP/2019/1336, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2019.
- The development proposed is GF front/rear & side extensions.

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 in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located at the corner of the junction between Bath Road and Pinglestone Close. The site contains an end of terrace dwelling which fronts onto Bath Road, with a front garden which wraps around to the side of the property and adjoins Pinglestone Close. The dwelling itself is a simple two-storey design with a mixture of brick, render and timber cladding on the walls, while the roof is pitched and finished in brown clay tiles. The dwellings along both Bath Road and Pinglestone Close are set back from the pavement by front gardens and there is a strong building line along both roads.

5. The new extension would as a result of its position on the property result in a prominent addition which would, because of its forward projection, flat roof design and proximity to the party boundary with Pinglestone Close appear as an incongruous addition which not reflect the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the area in general. It would result in a poorly designed addition which would not improve the character and quality of the area.

6. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy BE1 of *A Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies* and saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the *London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 1998) Saved Policies,* and the guidance contained within the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions*. These policies and guidance collectively require development to achieve a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area, with extensions harmonising with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building. The use of matching external materials does not outweigh the harm identified.

Other Matters

7. Whilst I have no doubt that the additional accommodation would be of benefit to the appellant and his family, it is likely that the development would be permanent and would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to exist. I therefore attach limited weight to this matter.

8. The appellant has referred me to examples of extensions which have been approved in the locality. In the case of No 16 Pinglestone Close, this extension appears to be of a different design to that before me, such that it is not directly comparable. No 35 the Rise is not a corner property and the proposal was for a two-storey extension. Thus, this proposal which was allowed at appeal[1] is not comparable to that before me either.

9. Although a number of photographs have been provided by the appellant showing development in the locality, no detailed drawings or information explaining the circumstances of these cases has been provided. The examples quoted by the appellant therefore carry limited weight in my assessment of the appeal proposal. Each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its own merits. The examples quoted do not provide justification for harmful development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR

[1] Ref APP/R5510/D/16/3149460