



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3329055

23 The Rise Hillingdon UB10 0JL

- 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 H Gulati against the decision of the council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 77530/APP/2023/1323, dated 5 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey extension to the side and part single storey, part double storey extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the description of development was amended by the council to reflect those elements that require planning permission. I have therefore used the amended description included in the decision notice for accuracy.
3. At the site visit, I noticed that some of the 'as built' alterations did not match those on the existing plans. The alterations included a full height window with Juliet balcony to the box dormer of the loft conversion and the existence of a conservatory on the ground floor. I have therefore considered the proposals in light of this.

Reasons

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, street scene and wider area.
5. The Rise is a pleasant residential street with a traditional suburban character. It is generally comprised of semi-detached and detached dwellings which are generally two storey. With a couple of exceptions, common features within the street include hipped and pitched roofs, dormer windows, chimneys and pitched roof porches. Dwellings are set back from the road behind front gardens which often serve as off road parking.
6. The appeal property (No 23) is on a corner plot located at a road junction with The Crossway. It is therefore highly visible from multiple positions within the public domain. The house on the other side of the junction (No 25) is a detached two storey house. However, in my view, both dwellings are of a

- similar scale and character and provide 'balance' within this part of the street scene.
7. At the site visit, I could see that a number of properties had been subject to extensions and alterations including loft conversions. Many of these extensions and alterations appear to reflect the established character of the area.
 8. The appeal proposals would result in significant single and double height extensions being added to the side and rear of the appeal property.
 9. Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) (LP1) seeks development that improves and maintains the quality of the built environment.
 10. Policy DMHB 11 (Design of New Development) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LP2) requires that all new development (including domestic extensions) is designed to harmonise with its local context. Policy DMHB 12 (Streets and Public Realm) of LP2 requires development to be integrated with its surroundings.
 11. DMHD 1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) of LP2 requires that all domestic extensions do not have an adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area, nor adjacent dwellings and that the proposals are subordinate to the host dwelling.
 12. From the principal elevation, the appeal proposals would appear to align with the character of the area where the side extension mono roof pitch would complement the existing dwelling. However, to the rear, the massing of the proposed extension coupled with the overall height would have the effect of adding significant bulk.
 13. The first-floor extension would 'jut out' from the newly widened rear elevation and this would, in my view, appear dominant and discordant, creating an awkward relationship with the remainder of the scheme.
 14. I also have concerns that as the box dormer windows and Juliet balcony have been newly constructed and were in place at the time of the site visit, the first-floor rear extension (and the roof for this extension) would not sit against this window appropriately. It is not clear to me whether the loft window would be retained as it is not shown on the existing elevational plans, nor have I been provided with plans to demonstrate how the appeal proposal would work considering the as-built condition of the appeal property.
 15. Given the prominent visual location of this application site, it is considered that the proposals (and the design of the rear extensions) would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, and the host dwelling contrary to policies BE1 of the LP2 and DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD1 of the LP2.

Conclusions

16. For the reasons given and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR