



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: 7th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3288288

Bridge House, 1A Bridge Way, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8QR

- 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 Amjad Ali against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 43797/APP/2021/2330, dated 5 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension, rear infill extension and first floor rear 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. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling situated on the corner of Bridge Way and Long Lane, an established residential area where the regular pattern of properties and gaps between and around properties is a characteristic of the local area.
4. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies, amongst other matters, that new development is of a high design quality and in keeping with the context of the surrounding area.
5. The submitted plans show that the proposed first and ground floor extensions to the rear of the property are modest in size and scale and as such would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.
6. As shown on the submitted plan, the proposed single storey side extension would largely fill the space to the side of the appeal property, projecting to within 0.25m of the boundary. The fence referred to by the appellant and existing trees and shrubs to the adjacent busy Long Lane (B644) would screen much of the proposed extension when viewed from that side.
7. Nonetheless, by occupying almost all of the space up to the boundary with Long Lane, the appeal scheme would erode the characteristic spacing between

- and around residential properties. Thus in this respect the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property.
8. Furthermore, I saw at the site visit that when viewed from the front of the appeal property, a prominent location at the entrance to Bridge Way, the proposed extension would appear as a large and disproportionate addition to the appeal property. As a result of the significant width of the proposed extension the appeal scheme would appear as a prominent and incongruous addition to the property, would not appear subordinate and thus would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the appeal property.
 9. I note that the appeal site has been subject of similar proposals before and that the appellant has made a number of alterations to the appeal scheme, including the use of a flat roof. Nonetheless these alterations do not overcome the harm I have identified previously.
 10. For the reasons detailed above I find that the appeal scheme will harm the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property contrary to Policy BE2 of the HLP and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD DMP.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to a number of other examples nearby. Based on the evidence before me and my observations on site, the presence of these extensions does not persuade me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

12. 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