The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 30 September 2021

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3280184
1 Maylands Drive, Uxbridge UB8 1BH

- 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 Kaushik Patel against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 16013/APP/2021/1441, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
- The development proposed is a Double Storey Side to Rear Extension, Relocation of Main door with Proposed Porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development ton the character and appeal of the area.

Reasons

3. Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (the LP) seeks to protect the character, appearance and design quality of an area and details that "i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property"

4. The appeal scheme would replace the existing detached garage and boundary wall with a two-storey extension that would wrap around the side and rear of the appeal property, a semi-detached property. Together, the pair of semi-detached properties occupy a prominent corner position in the street opposite a similarly designed pair of semi-detached properties at the entrance to Heron Close.

5. The proposed extension is shown on the submitted plans as being of substantial scale and size in itself and in proportion to the appeal property. Furthermore, the resultant roof form is large and complex, particularly when viewed along with that of the attached property.

6. I note that the side extension is show as being of a substantial width and while no specific dimensions are provided, the Council details that the proposed extension is in excess of half the width of the existing property, this is not disputed by the appellant.

7. The appellant refers to the "Hillingdon Residential Guide", I have not been provided with a copy of this Supplementary Planning Document, but the appellant clearly highlights that the guidance allows side extensions that are

between half and two-thirds of the original house width, identifying that the proposed extension is two-thirds of the width of the original house. The appellant also makes reference to the size of the appeal site being larger than that found elsewhere. Nevertheless, greater weight must be afforded to the provisions of Policy DMHD1 that forms part of the adopted Development Plan.

8. As a result of the prominent position of the appeal site within the streetscene and the combination of the significant width of the proposed side extension and resultant large and complex roof structure, I find that the appeal scheme would appear as a prominent and discordant feature in the street that would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy DMHD1 of the LP.

Other Matters

9. The submitted plans have been annotated to demonstrate that a 45-degree line from the centre of the closest windows in the neighbouring properties are not broken by the appeal scheme. That the appeal scheme would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties is not at dispute at this appeal and on the basis of the evidence before me I have no substantive reason to disagree. The absence of harm in this instance does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

10. The appellant has identified a number of other properties that it is stated have been extended in a similar manner to that proposed here. I have very few details of these schemes, the policies and circumstances that applied at the time that planning permission was granted and in any event each proposal is determined on its own merits.

Conclusion

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

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR