
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3243428
107 West Drayton Road, Uxbridge UB8 3LE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nadeem Khan against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 7796/APP/2019/1312 dated 5 April 2019 was refused by notice dated 17 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a new one bedroom penthouse above the existing 3 storey building with associated parking and storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the Council's decision, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies (2012), and the London Borough of Hillingdon Residential Extensions and Residential Layouts Supplementary Planning Documents have been withdrawn. The above policies are superseded by Policies DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP). Interested parties have had opportunity to comment on the proposal in the light of these policies. I determine the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a three-storey apartment building with a flat roof. It is located on a corner of the busy crossroads of West Drayton Road and the A437 Harlington Road. This contributes to the prominence of the site.
5. The approach to the appeal site from the south along Harlington Road is characterised by pairs of two-storey dwellings with pitched roof profiles, occasionally interspersed with three storey properties. The appeal property is located at the end of a row of dwellings on a stretch of West Drayton Road, between Dawley Road and the crossroads. The southern side of this stretch is characterised by pairs of two-storey semi-detached dwellings with catslide roofs, which lead up to the appeal site. The northern side comprises mainly

pairs of two storey semi-detached dwellings with hip roofs. As such, two storey pairs of dwellings with pitched roof profiles are noticeably distinctive elements of the mainly twentieth century suburban character and architectural rhythm of the area.

6. Within this context, the proposed fourth storey mass would, in accumulation with the three storey mass of the host building, result in a visually harsh step up in scale and angularity of profile, next to the preceding row of 'catslide semis' on West Drayton Road. Moreover, the partly grey clad, angular mass of the fourth storey would further distract from and visually jar with the character of the area. The prominence of the site and the proximity of the host building to the culminating catslide semi at No 105 West Drayton Road would emphasise the discordance of the proposed addition. The above effects would be noticeable to various degrees from viewpoints along West Drayton Road and Morello Avenue. The proposed fourth storey would also loom up jarringly, viewed from the gardens of No 105.
7. Furthermore, the proposal would appear as a 'top heavy' angular addition, which would compete discordantly with the modernist style appearance of the rounded-corner facade of the host building that faces onto Harlington Road.
8. I appreciate the appellant's intention to reduce the impact of the proposal through glazing and set back from the parapet wall.
9. However, for the reasons described above, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB11 of the DMP and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016)¹. Together, the policies seek to ensure that development complements local context and character.
10. Policy DMHB12 of the DMP focuses on design, use and safety of the public realm. Thus it is not engaged in respect of the main issue in this case.

Other Matters

11. I note resident concerns regarding light, noise and privacy. As I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, it is not necessary for me to consider these matters further.
12. The proposal would provide additional residential accommodation in the form of a one bedroom apartment, with associated socio-economic benefits during and after construction. However, the public benefits would be limited by the scale of development and would not outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR

¹ The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2011, March 2016.