



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

**Decision by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> March 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3290125**

**127 Broadwood Avenue, Ruislip, HA4 7XU**

- 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 Keith and Kathy Taylor against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 12443/APP/2021/3158, dated 16 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2021.
  - The development proposed is First floor extension above existing ground floor extension and porch to front of house.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. A front porch has been included within the proposal although the Council do not raise this element as part of the reason for refusal and I have no reason to contradict their findings.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the first floor extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is positioned in a cul-du-sac within a planned housing development. The houses follow a similar finished materials palette although they have their own individual style and form.
5. The appeal property has been extended to the side by virtue of a single storey extension that extends from the front building line and projects well beyond the rear building line of the original dwelling into the garden where it is wider than the front part of the building. The proposed extension would be erected above part of this extension and broadly centrally positioned. It would be set back from the front building line of the existing extension and positioned above an element of it.
6. As a consequence of its location, it would appear as a disjointed addition and not an integral part of the existing extension. As part of the requirements of Council Policy DMHD1 that relates to household extensions, even though the ground floor element may not be half the width of the main dwelling, with the extension set back, irrespective of this, the policy seeks extensions to be of a scale that is subservient to the original dwelling.

7. Even with the use of the style of proposed roof over, its overall scale and massing would appear top heavy and bulky. This proposal would not be subordinate to the host dwelling or complement the architectural characteristics of the original dwelling.
8. Given the location of the dwelling within the cul-du-sac, the house is highly visible within the street scene. The proposal would therefore be seen directly in public views from the main access road into the estate. There may be another two storey side extension seen adjacent, however they do not bear the same characteristics as the proposal before me and therefore I apply limited weight to this comparison.
9. The proposed extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the main dwelling and would thus harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and lead to harm arising to the character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore, it would not accord with the design expectations of 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 2020.

### **Other Matters**

10. There may be no letters of representation received to the proposal from local occupants. However, the absence of objections in this regard is a neutral matter and neither weighs for or against the proposal.

### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal seeks permission for both a porch and side extension, and as no split decision has been sought by the appellant, as a whole I can only conclude that the proposal would thus 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. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*Alison Scott*

INSPECTOR