



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3245618

101 Park Lane, Hayes UB4 8AF

- 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 Sandeep Banger against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 14754/APP/2019/3301, dated 7 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. Since the determination of the appeal the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), of relevance in this instance are Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19, no longer forms part of the Development Plan. The Council has also stated that the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions referred to in the decision notice has also been withdrawn. The relevant policies are therefore Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Development Management Policies with Modifications (January 2020) (the LP).
3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property.

Reasons

4. The appeal site occupies a prominent position by virtue of its location at the junction of Park Lane and Frogmore Gardens and as a result of the reclining building line of properties fronting on to Frogmore Gardens.
5. The proposed extensions are considerable, wrapping around the side (above the existing single storey extension) and rear (at ground floor level) of the existing semi-detached property.
6. Policies DMHB11 and DMHD 1 of the LP require new development, amongst other matters, to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and harmonise with the local context.
7. The submitted plans show that the first-floor side extension is set back by approximately 1 metre from the front elevation of the existing building and the

roof down by some 500mm, but I note that the extension would also project beyond the rear elevation of the property. Furthermore, at the ground floor level the proposed rear extension would project a considerable distance from the rear elevation of the existing property. In combination, the proposed extension is of a considerable size and scale in and of itself and in relation to the existing property.

8. At the site visit I saw that, when viewed from the street, the proposed extensions would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature harming the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property.
9. Therefore, I find that the appeal scheme is contrary to Policies DMHB11 and DMHD 1 of the LP.

Other Matters

10. The appellant states that a key benefit of the proposed extension is the significant improvement to the quality of living accommodation for the appellant and his family. This is a material consideration to which I attach some weight, but it is largely a private benefit and does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.
11. At the site visit I saw other properties in the area that had been subject of various extensions. The presence of these extensions do not persuade me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

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

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR