



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3285484

245 Park Road, Uxbridge, UB8 1NS

- 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 S Imam against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76478/APP/2021/2871, dated 1 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal is made together with Number 243 Park Road and that decision determined under separate cover.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The character of the area is residential to this side of Park Road and overlooks a busy dual carriageway and undeveloped open space beyond. The appeal property is semi-detached to No 243. Both properties share the same design characteristics and are symmetrical in appearance. Whilst there is substantial contrast to the dwellings along this side of Park Road, this pair of semi's is paired with the houses of 247 and 249 Park Road. These semi's also retain significant symmetry, and as a set, these houses contributes positively to the character and appearance of the street scene.
5. The proposal is an in-fill to the front elevation of the dwelling in order to extend the hall with an enlarged bedroom above.
6. The pair of semi's is closely associated with the adjacent pair of semi's that also shares the same characteristics and symmetry. By extending the house at appeal before me, would significantly distort the character of this set of houses. This would be further reinforced by the proposed roof. The main roof of all four houses is hipped, with the projecting front elements also hipped making a characteristic design feature. The proposed roof configuration would be at significant odds with these distinctive roof features.

7. The houses are clearly visible within the street scene. Even if both occupants would be prepared to undertake work at the same time to retain the symmetry of the pair of houses, the imbalance that would ensue between the semi-detached houses and the adjacent pair at 247-249 would lead to adverse harm arising to the character and appearance of the group, and consequently the street scene.
8. Therefore, to conclude, the proposal would not respect the design features of the original dwelling and lead to harm arising to the distinctive character of the houses as a group of semi-detached houses, and to the street scene. This would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Development Management Policies 2020 in their combined design aims.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

