



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3304120

3 Cowslip Close, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9QN

- 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 Enoch Mukeba against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 77147/APP/2022/893, dated 16 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2022.
 - The development proposed was originally described as double story side and single story rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 22 and 23 Hyacinth Drive with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling within a suburban residential area. The houses within the cul-de-sac, and others in the vicinity, are similar styles with common rhythms in their designs, either having a gable facing the front (like the appeal property) or gables to the sides.
4. The proposed side extension would be designed with a side gable, with a very low roof pitch. This would contrast significantly with the gable and roof style of the host property and would appear unduly bulky from the side. It would have a very small step back at the first floor and ground floor resulting in a large expanse of brickwork on the side. This would be exacerbated by the additional depth of the single storey extension to the rear.
5. The detailing of the extension, such as the front first floor window being larger than the existing first floor windows, the omission of brick heads to match others on the first floor and the very small lean-to roof on the front ground floor would all contribute further to a design that would fail to harmonise with the character of the host dwelling.

6. There would be a small loss of a gap at the first floor between the built form and the neighbouring plots to the side. However, as this borders the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties with a gap to the nearest house, it would not appear cramped.
7. The acceptability of other parts of the design such as the materials do not outweigh my findings in relation to the overall appearance of the proposed development. Moreover, although the dwelling is not prominent in the street scene, this does not justify a scheme that would result in a discordant extension on the host dwelling seen in localised or private views.
8. My attention has been drawn to extensions that have been approved in the area. However, I only have firm details of two of these extensions which are at No 11 Hyacinth Drive and No 11 Cowslip Close. As such, I cannot be certain that the circumstances of the other extensions are the same. Neither No 11 Hyacinth Drive or No 11 Cowslip Close share the same combination of wide gable with a low roof pitch, minimal set back and detailing as that proposed. Both were designed with step backs at first floor, a hipped roof, either no rear extension or a small single storey rear extension and detailing that harmonises with the host property. In any case, I have assessed the appeal proposal on its own merits.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (LP2) (2020) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), insofar as they are relevant to this main issue. These say, amongst other things, that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that new extensions respect the design of the original house.

Living conditions

10. The proposal would result in an increased massing next to the garden of No 22 and to a lesser extent No 23 Hyacinth Drive (No 22 and 23). It would be a clearly prominent addition to the occupiers of both No 22 and 23 from within the respective rear gardens and rear rooms of the properties. This would be particularly the case for the occupiers of No 22, given its position relative to the proposed side extension. Whereas the rear of No 23, and its garden, have an outlook more toward the rear garden of the appeal property. In this regard, I do not find that the effects on the outlook from No 23 would be unacceptably harmful.
11. However, due to the particularly close relationship of the proposed extension to the rear of No 22, and the proposed design with its large wide gable on the common boundary, the proposal would result in a significantly imposing massing of brickwork. The dominance and extent of brickwork on the boundary would, in my view, be an oppressive stark feature which would not be mitigated by any existing planting due to the height of the proposed extension on the boundary.
12. From the evidence before me, the extensions at both No 11 Hyacinth Drive and No 11 Cowslip Close were not built on the common boundary with their

respective neighbouring properties. As such, even discounting the difference in design previously outlined, neither share the same imposing relationship as the proposal before me would do to No 22.

13. I therefore find that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 22 with particular reference to outlook. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11 of the LP2 and the provisions of the Framework. These stipulate, amongst other things, that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved.

Other Matters

14. I recognise that the appellant is seeking to make an effective use of an existing dwelling, an objective which is encouraged by the Framework. I understand that extending the property might meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns. Moreover, any environmental, economic, and social benefits from an extension would be very small and I have no firm evidence that other options have been considered and discounted that may also realise similar benefits. Overall, the appellant's desire to extend the property, and the benefits outlined, do not outweigh my concerns on the main issues.
15. The absence of harm in relation to other matters, including other criteria of policies in the development plan, are neutral matters that weigh neither for nor against the proposal. They do not, therefore, overcome my concerns in relation to the main issues.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
17. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR