



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3284450

36 Morello Avenue, Uxbridge UB8 3ES

- 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 Rezwan Mahmood against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 61591/APP/2021/2493, dated 23 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

3. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (the HLP) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part two – Development Management Policies (the DMP), amongst other matters, seeks that new development be of high-quality design that incorporates well into the surrounding context.
4. The appeal scheme proposes a first-floor side extension above the existing single storey extension to the side of the property. As a result of the location of the appeal property on a corner of the street, the proposed extension would occupy a prominent position within the street that is otherwise characterised by the regular pattern of semi-detached properties and the spaces between the properties.
5. The submitted plans show that while the existing ground floor extension is situated immediately adjacent to the boundary with 38 Morello Avenue, the proposed first floor extension would be set off the boundary at the front of the property by, as detailed by the Appellants Grounds of appeal, 1.2m. Though I note that as a result of the angle of the boundary in relation to the appeal property, the rear of the proposed extension is chamfered and situated immediately adjacent to the boundary.
6. I saw at the site visit that the attached property, 34 Morello Avenue, has not been subject to the extent of alterations and extensions that the appeal property has. Consequently, the addition of a further extension, in particular at

first floor level and in a prominent position, would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, harming the character and appearance of the area.

7. I note that the proposed extension is set back from the front elevation of the property and, to the front of the proposed extension, off the boundary with the neighbouring property. Nonetheless, as a result of the constraints of the site and the proximity of the boundary, the proposed extension is shown as being of a somewhat contrived appearance with a chamfered rear portion and a complex roof arrangement.
8. As a result of the proximity of the proposed extension to the boundary and therefore the adjacent property, the appeal scheme would result in an erosion of the gap that separates the neighbouring properties, a characteristic of the area.
9. For the reasons detailed above I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property contrary to Policy BE1 of the HLP and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the DMP.

Conclusion

10. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR

