

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

**by Mrs H Nicholls MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29 January 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3242676**

**69 Harvey Road, Uxbridge UB10 0HS**

- 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 Ajmal Jabarkhil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 45334/APP/2019/2922, dated 7 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is construction of double-storey side/rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. On 16 January 2020 the Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (LPP2) and this replaces the former Local Plan: Part Two (2012). The Council referred to the emerging policies in its decision notice and both parties have been provided with an opportunity to comment on the updated policy context in relation to the appeal proposal.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. Harvey Road is generally characterised by two storey dwellings in semi-detached pairs or short terraces. Red brick and rendered blockwork form the predominant building materials. Whilst a number of dwellings have been extended in the wider area, the overall impression is of a well-preserved suburban context with all dwellings retaining much of their original character and proportions.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling on a corner plot. Due to its siting at an approximate 45 degree angle to Harvey Road and Glisson Road, its garden wraps around both the side and rear elevations, providing a sense of spaciousness that only appears to benefit those dwellings which turn the corners in a similar fashion. The garden area is enclosed by a low wall and a substantial hedge which screens some views of the side elevation, although upper parts of the dwelling and its roof are visible from the east, approximately midway along Harvey Road.

6. The proposal would increase the rearward projection of the dwelling by some 3.6 metres and an additional 2.6 metres of width would also be added to the side with the same rearward projection. The front wall of the side extension would be set back from the existing front building line of the main house by 1 metre. The ridgeline of the hipped roof would be set down from the highest part of the existing ridgeline by approximately 1 metre.
7. Whilst the degree of set back from the front building line and set down from the ridge height would appear to accord with the requirements of LPP2 Policy DMHD1, the width of the extension would exceed half of the width of the original dwellinghouse, contrary to the requirements of the same. When combined with the substantial length of the rearward projection, the width of the extension would appear excessive in relation to the host dwelling. Due to its overall scale, bulk and massing, the proposal would overwhelm the host dwelling, rather than appear subordinate to it. It would also undermine the pleasant overall impression of symmetry currently presented by the dwelling along with its adjoining neighbour, No 32 Glisson Road and which is also presented by the opposite corner plot dwellings at No 74 Harvey Road and No 34 Glisson Road.
8. Notwithstanding the Council's comments, the rear elevation is not currently a prominent feature in the streetscene. Along with the front elevation, the side elevation is the most prominent element in the streetscene with views attainable immediately outside of the site and in longer views from the east. In these views, the largely featureless side elevation, which would extend over 10 metres in length and 2 storeys in height, would form an unrelenting and visually incongruous element of the street scene. The removal of some of the rear and side boundary hedgerow to facilitate the creation of a parking space would also open up these views to the detriment of the quality of the street scene.
9. The appellant refers to the unbuilt extension which was allowed on appeal in 2010 for No 57 Gresham Road, in relation to which I have limited details. Given that the extension has not been constructed, it does not constitute a precedent for allowing similar proposals, particularly in light of the new policy circumstances that are applicable.
10. Similarly, I visited No 81 Misbourne Road as part of my site assessment and noted that the appeal proposal would have a greater length of unrelenting side elevation facing the street scene. Therefore, whilst accepting that there is some degree of subjectivity in the assessment of changes to the character and appearance of an area, I consider that the appeal proposal would be harmful to its setting for the reasons identified.
11. In view of this main issue, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part One<sup>1</sup> and Policies DMHD1 and DMHD11 of the LPP2. Read together, these policies seek to ensure that new development is designed to the highest standards and that new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012)

12. The proposal would also fail to adhere to guidance in the Residential Extensions SPD<sup>2</sup> in terms of its effect on the character and quality of the overall street scene.

### **Other Matters**

13. I note that the proposal represents a more modest extension to the dwelling than was proposed by an earlier application. Whilst I have limited details in this regard, any reductions in scale do not overcome the harm that I have identified.
14. The appellant has highlighted the approach promoted by the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') for Councils to enable development and avoid an overly-prescriptive approach. Whilst I have had regard to this advice, I am also mindful that the Framework enshrines a development plan-led approach which seeks to ensure that new development takes opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area, which the proposal would fail to do.
15. That the proposal would not raise any issues of highway safety or compromise the living conditions of occupiers or neighbouring occupiers are factors that neither weigh for, or against the scheme.
16. I have taken account of the appellant's family's needs for additional accommodation and that a holistic design approach has been adopted in an attempt to comply with the relevant Development Plan policies. I also note that the proposal is not in a Conservation Area and that it would incorporate matching construction materials that could be secured by condition.
17. However, these highlighted matters do not amount to considerations of sufficient materiality to outweigh the identified harm and associated Development Plan conflict.

### **Conclusion**

18. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

*Hollie Nicholls*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (December 2008)