

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2021

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3263677

93 and 95 Harlington Road, Uxbridge, UB8 3HZ

- 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 Hayer and Mr Linder against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74630/APP/2020/2223, dated 19 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a joint first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a combined first floor rear extension to both of these semi-detached properties. They would not be as deep as the ground floor rear extensions. The first floor additions would have partially hipped roofs with a flat crown roof beyond. Each property has a large dormer roof structure and although they are similar in form and scale, they do not match given the slight differences in dimensions and the different cladding materials. They do however dominate the rear roof slopes and they appear at odds with the form and character of the original dwelling. Whilst these do not form part of this proposal, the first floor extensions would have a very close relationship with them.
 4. The narrow hipped areas of the new roofs and the new element of flat roof would be at odds with the character and appearance of the original building. This arrangement would dominate the original form of the properties and would appear contrived and at odds with the character of the buildings. When viewed with the existing roof structures, the different elements would sit uncomfortably together. The proposal would represent poor design and would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of these properties.
 5. I do not agree that the extensions would have a positive impact with regard to the proportions of the building or that the crown roof would add interest or
-

minimise its visual impact. The stepped arrangement between the existing ground floor extensions and the second floor additions would not provide a positive design solution as suggested. The combination of materials, the form of the crown roof and the scale of the works, would be at odds with the original form and character of the building. I do not find that the combined nature of the proposal changes this assessment.

6. I have had regard to the other properties that have been extended in the vicinity and the variety of property types locally. I do not find that this variety offers support for these works. With regard to the specific examples of other properties referred to, the alterations to 127 Harlington Road do not appear to be similar to those currently proposed. I acknowledge that at 164 North Hyde Road, the rear addition does have a poor relationship with the host dwelling. I am not aware of the circumstances that led to that decision and must consider this proposal on its own merits. However, that example does emphasise the importance of avoiding poor design.
7. I acknowledge that the rear elevations of these properties are not publically prominent. Lack of prominence is not however a good reason for accepting poor design. Furthermore, in this case, the upper areas, which are of greatest concern, are clearly visible from a number of vantage points along Nicholls Avenue. The proposal would detract from the character and appearance of these properties and attention would be drawn to the incongruous relationship that is proposed. As the development would represent poor design, it would conflict with the aspirations of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012; and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020. These policies are consistent with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework and can be afforded full weight.
8. As I have not found there to be any matters that outweigh my concerns, I dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR