



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2021

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3273418

31 Brandville Road, West Drayton UB7 9DA

- 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 Amarjit Bains against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 39741/APP/2020/4070, dated 8 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two and a half storey, detached dwelling which occupies a corner position at the junction of Brandville Road and Furzeham Road. The property is characterised by two-storey bay windows to the front elevation and traditional detailing. A small extension is situated to the side of the property towards the rear. The area is mainly comprised of traditional two-storey terraced and semi-detached properties.
4. The gable ends of both the appeal property and number 33 Brandville Road (No 33), situated on the opposite side of the junction with Furzeham Road are set-in from the side boundary walls. The resultant gap provides an important visual break and allows views along Furzeham Road and so contributes to the legibility of the traditional urban form and the spacious character of the area.
5. There is an existing brick wall to the side of the property, together with a hedgerow which is characteristic of boundary treatment in the area. Whilst the proposal would appear subservient in scale to the host property; it would result in an irregular, wedge-shaped extension which would completely fill the characteristic gap between the gable wall and site boundary. The proposal would appear cramped and fail to reflect the original plan form of the property.
6. The conservatory wall and roof would be markedly higher than the existing brick wall and it would extend a significant proportion of the side boundary. Furthermore, the irregular shaped conservatory would be at odds with other

boundary treatment in the area. Due to its prominent corner position, the proposal would be highly visible in the street scene when viewed from both Brandville and Furzeham Roads. The glazed material would do little to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal.

7. The proposal would bring forward the predominant return building line of Furzeham Road. This would detract from the openness of the area and undermine the legibility of the urban form. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to criterion ii, Part C of Policy DMHD 1 of the Council's Local Plan Part 2-Development Management Policies (LPP2 DMP) which requires extensions to corner plots to ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and that the return building line is not exceeded. Overall, I consider that the proposal would represent an incongruous form of development at odds with the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
8. Whilst there is an existing small extension to the side of the appeal property this is set well in from the side boundary and to the rear and so maintains openness. Furthermore, it is parallel to the existing flank wall of the appeal property as opposed to the site boundary.
9. I acknowledge the presence of the garage to the rear of the appeal property which exceeds the Furzeham Road building line. However, I consider that the predominant building line is formed by the row of semi-detached properties on the northern side of the road. Furthermore, the garage is situated to the rear, and not in such a prominent corner position as the appeal proposal. Moreover, no details of this case have been provided and so I cannot be certain that it benefits from planning permission or was determined within the same planning policy framework which limits the weight which I can attach to it in my appeal decision.
10. Whilst the proposal would provide extended living accommodation for the existing occupiers this would not outweigh the significant harm which I have identified.
11. For the reasons stated, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the LPP2 DMP which collectively seek to ensure a high standard of new development which harmonises with the local context.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated and taking into account all other considerations the appeal is dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector