



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3278930

61 Thornhill Road, Ickenham UB10 8SQ

- 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 Zubair Sheikh against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 22378/APP/2020/3790, dated 17 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, single-storey side extension, rear extension, and associated alterations.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 July 2021. Regard has been had to the revised national policy as a material consideration in the decision-making process. However, in this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. There is therefore no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached building set back from the road. Although most dwellings on the eastern side of Thornhill Road are similar in this respect, there is variation in each buildings size, form, and design. The spacing between properties also varies and some dwellings come close to fully occupying the width of the site. No 61 Thornhill Road is noticeably smaller than the dwellings either side of it. The ground-floor element on the southern side of No 61 closely adjoins the ground-floor element on the northern side of 63 Thornhill Road, although there is space between them at first-floor and roof level.

6. A walled side entrance to the rear of No 61 lies between No 61 and 59 Thornhill Road, however, there otherwise remains a considerable amount of space between the two dwellings. No 59 is situated further back than No 61 such that much of its side elevation is visible from the garden of No 61. The ground-floor element at No 63 also extends further eastward relative to No 61. The appeal property maintains a spacious garden, due mostly to its substantial depth.
7. The double-gable roof form at the rear would create an abrupt end to the roof at the eastern end of the property along both side elevations, and appear unsympathetic to the original hipped roof. The double-gable roof form would also relate poorly to the rest of the roof form when viewed from the rear. It would appear particularly awkward given that the middle portion of the roof would be off-centre in relation to the symmetrical double-gable. For these reasons, the extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Although No 63 has a single gable at the rear, its relationship with the rest of the roof is different to that which has been described above. It is, in comparison to the proposal, limited in its degree of effect, and is present on only one side of the building. The appeal is considered with respect to its own individual merits, and whilst there is some variety in the design of rear elevations along Thornhill Road, this would not mitigate the harm identified.
8. Both side extensions proposed would be subordinate to the original dwelling in that they would be set back and would not individually exceed half the width of the original property. Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LPP2) does not clearly indicate that side extensions in combination should not exceed half the width of the original property. Given that the first-floor element of the proposal on the southern side would be narrower than the ground-floor development, and that space at first-floor level would remain near the boundary at No 63, the side extension on the southern side would not appear cramped and harm would not arise. The side extension on the northern side would be narrower than the side extension on the southern side, and the space which would remain between Nos 61 and 59 would be sufficient to avoid harm arising to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed porch would not be significantly larger than the existing porch and would be clearly subordinate to the dwelling. It would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This, however, would not mitigate or outweigh the harm that would arise in respect of the rear portion of the development.
9. For these reasons, the development as a whole would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11, and DMHB 12 of the LPP2 which together seek to ensure development achieves a high-quality of design, harmonises with the local context, is well integrated with the surrounding area, and avoids an adverse impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR