



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2021 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3259252

16 The Dingle, Uxbridge UB10 0DQ

- 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 Tabassam Rashid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 52360/APP/2020/2254, dated 21 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2020.
 - The proposed development is 1st 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse in a residential area. The property has been subject to a full-width, ground-floor, lean-to rear extension and features a large dormer extension within its rear roof slope.
 5. The proposed extension would be set within the lean-to roof form of the single-storey extension and would also project above the rear eave of the host building. Due to its form and scale, the hipped roof of the proposal would contrast poorly with the lean-to roof of the ground-floor rear extension, the pitched roof form of the appeal property and the rear dormer extension. As the resultant appearance of the rear elevation would appear uneven and overly cluttered, the proposal would constitute an unsympathetic addition that would distort the proportions of the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
 6. While I accept that the proposal would not appear overly prominent in public views, it would nonetheless appear particularly incongruous within private views from neighbouring properties.
-

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012), which states that all new development should achieve a high quality of design. The proposal would also conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020), which respectively state that all new development, including extensions, will be required to be designed to the highest standards, and that new extensions will be required to respect the design of the original house.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future and neighbouring occupants. However, this does not justify the identified harm that would be caused by the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

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.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR