



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2020 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3248996

110 Fairholme Crescent, Hayes UB4 8QU

- 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 Parminder against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 61731/APP/2020/15, dated 6 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor side & part first floor rear 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.

Procedural Matter

3. It is clear from the Council's decision that it has no objection to the rear extension. I have no evidence before me to reach a contrary view to the Council in this regard and therefore the consideration of this appeal focuses on the effect of the proposed first floor side extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a prominently sited two-storey, semi-detached house situated on a corner plot within a residential area, where there is a fairly tight-knit arrangement of houses. I observed multiple gaps between the houses in the area, which serve to break-up the mass of built form, and provide a sense of spaciousness to the area.
6. In this regard, the short access road between the host property and its neighbour on the opposite side of this road, and the single storey development of each property adjoining the road, contribute to the open spacious quality of this part of Fairholme Crescent, and the appreciation of the open space of the park to the rear of it.

7. The appeal proposal, although modest in scale, with a set-back and a set-in, would be prominent in the street scene and would as a result of its design reduce this sense of openness and the appreciation of the open space beyond. It would reduce the contribution that the appeal site makes to the character and appearance of the area and would erode views to the park and the Green Belt of which it forms part, from Fairholme Crescent.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed first floor side extension would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and accordingly there would be conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (adopted January 2020) ('DMP') which collectively seek to ensure that extensions of dwellings do not result in an adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area. The proposal would also conflict with Policy DMEI 6 of the DMP which provides that new development adjacent to the Green Belt should assimilate into the surrounding area by the use of extensive peripheral landscaping to site boundaries, given that there would be limited scope for this due to the existing dwelling's position close to the boundary with the access road.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

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.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR