



Appeal Decisions

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: 16th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3280848

3 Highfield Drive, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8AL

- 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 Mrs S Farzana against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 4075/APP/2021/1963, dated 13 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for an award of costs has been submitted by the appellant and is 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. Highfield Drive is a suburban residential housing development with dwellings of different design, sizes and ages within. This part of Highfield Drive has a greater sense of spaciousness to its character given the building layouts, together with the estate road layout.
5. The appeal property is a substantial detached dwelling that sits back from the estate road with a wide frontage in a generously sized plot. The front building line is staggered by virtue of two-storey elements extending from the main dwelling, and the main entrance identified by a portico feature that is located off-centre.
6. The existing front projecting elements are subordinate in scale to the main dwelling with corresponding roofs over.
7. The character of a house is formed by its proportions, materials, roof shape and architectural details. The front elevation is often the most visible and prominent part of the house and it has a key role to play in defining its character.
8. The proposal would create substantial additional built form to the host dwelling. The hipped roofs proposed over the projecting elements that would only be

slightly lower than the ridge line of the host dwelling, would further emphasise its dominance.

9. It may create symmetry to the front elevation of the host dwelling. However, its proportions would not respect the proportions of the original house, and its overall scale would be detrimentally distorted thus creating an incongruous appearance which would adversely alter its original characteristics.
10. Even though there may be diversity to the houses within Highfield Drive, this proposal would not respect the architectural composition of the host property. In particular, it would not meet the objectives of Local Plan Policy DMHD 1 that allows front extensions provided they are minor and do not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street scene. Based on the proposal before me, it's prominence within the street scene would appear obtrusive, adversely harming the character and appearance of it.
11. An appeal decision at 35 Highfield Drive has been pointed to by the appellant as a comparison development. This proposal sought front extensions as part of the overall scheme. However, that house does not share precisely the same characteristics as the appeal dwelling. It is a different house type and experienced in a different setting and context, in addition it is a considerably smaller building with a reduced impact upon the street scene than the proposal before me. The scale of development is not commensurate with the proposal before me which has been assessed on its own individual merits. I therefore apply limited weight to this comparison.
12. Therefore, to conclude, the proposal would not respect the character of the host dwelling leading to harm arising to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would conflict with 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 broad design aims.

Other Matters

13. The proposal may increase internal space for family members. However, that is not to say that this could be achieved by other means than this scheme.
14. The appellant considers the proposal accords with design policies of the London Plan 2021. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council have based their decision on the relevant development plan policies.

Conclusion

15. Given the harmful effect of the proposed development on the character of the dwelling and impact on the street scene, it 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