



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 September 2020

by Rachel Walmsley MSc, MA, BSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3252318

1 Chirk Close, HAYES, UB4 9RD

- 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 Sazan Majeed against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 38941/APP/2020/287, dated 21 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension and single storey side extensions to main building of detached dwelling. Single storey side extension to existing detached garage, part conversion of garage to habitable use including alterations to front elevation, erection of cycle and garden store, provision of bin store and provision of photovoltaic panels to roof of garage and roof of cycle and garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. When considered individually, the extensions would in general terms respect the form and scale of the original dwelling and garage, including the two-storey rear extension which would be set down from the existing ridge line and would extend a modest distance from the rear of the property. However, as it is located within an area in which properties are generally of similar size, the overall increase in the size of the appeal property would appear unsympathetic to the scale of the original house. This would be exacerbated by the highly visible location of the property, meaning that the extensions would appear unduly prominent and overbearing in the street scene.
4. The windows on the first-floor rear extension would be unduly large when compared with the size of the existing windows. The development would therefore appear incongruous, in relation to the appeal dwelling and in relation to the surrounding houses which exhibit smaller apertures.
5. I appreciate the restrictions in moving to a new house and I have no doubt that the development would create a more functional and spacious family home. However, there is nothing in the evidence before me to suggest that the amount of accommodation proposed is what's needed for the number of people

residing at the property. Furthermore, there is no evidence of the proposed development being the optimum solution.

6. Whilst extending the garage would make vehicular access to it easier, removing the existing gates would have the same affect. It appears that the development proposed is not the only way to address problems associated with on-street parking. This matter, therefore, carries limited weight in favour of the appeal.
7. A notable area of the garden is already enclosed and with no evidence of littering being an insurmountable problem, the benefit of the development to the accumulation of rubbish is limited.
8. Amending the design of the development to overcome previous reasons for refusal is a welcome approach. However, for the reasons given, the amendments have not resulted in a development that is free from harm.
9. For the reasons given, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 and policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 which seek development that, amongst other matters, has no adverse impact on local character and the appearance of the street.

Other matter

10. I note the appellant's grievances concerning the decision-making process but it is not within the remit of this appeal for me to comment on the circumstances that led the Council to its decision.

Conclusion

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

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR